THE TRINITARIAN Controverſy reviewed: OR, A DEFENCE OF THE APPEAL to the Common Senſe of all Chriſtian People, &c.

WHEREIN

Every Particular advanced by the Reverend Dr. M'DONNELL in his Sincere Chriſtian's Anſwer to the Appeal, is diſtinctly conſidered; ſeveral other Subjects relative to the Queſtion, are diſcuſſed;

AND

An humble Attempt is made to put a final Period, if poſſible, to this Controverſy, by a ſolemn Addreſs to the moſt judicious Defenders of the Athanaſian Trinity.

By the AUTHOR of the APPEAL.

Prove all things; hold faſt that which is good. 1 Theſſ. v. 21.

Theſe were more noble than thoſe in Theſſalonica, in that they received the word with all readineſs of mind, and ſearched the Scriptures daily, whether theſe things were ſo.
Acts xvii. 11.

LONDON:
Printed for A. MILLAR, in the Strand.
M DCC LX.

BRITISH MUSEUM

AN

ANSWER

TO THE

PREFACE.

"AN Appeal to the common ſenſe of all Chriſtian people, naturally ſuppoſes, that all Chriſtian people are competent judges of the ſubject matter of ſuch Appeal."

Anſ. I cannot help judging, that common Chriſtians are enabled by God, to form a judgment about doctrines they are required to believe and profeſs: for otherwiſe, the kind and compaſſionate Father of all rational creatures muſt be deemed a rigorous tyrant, who requires a duty, without affording ſufficient means to perform it: from whence it may be juſtly inferred, that the

articles of belief neceſſary to ſalvation, muſt be few, plain and eaſy to be underſtood; as, indeed, they are repreſented in the Goſpel of Chriſt, which was preached to the poor, mean, and ignorant, as well as the wiſe and learned.

" But the author of the Appeal has exceeded the bounds, to which he profeſſed to confine his Appeal. He hath frequently deviated from the tranſlated text of Scripture, which only his judges can underſtand. He hath been obliged to have recourſe to the authority of the learned, in ſupport of his corrections of the vulgar tranſlation; and as often advanced his own comments and paraphraſes, which his judges are implicitely to aſſent to upon his bare word. It is evident then, that the learned only are judges in this debate, the bulk of mankind being incapable of conſulting the original; they muſt depend upon the authority of the learned for the plaineſt truths in the tranſlated text, of which therefore, they are only ſo far judges, as they have received conviction from the teſtimony of the learned, that the ſacred books have been carefully preſerved, and as faithfully tranſlated."

Anſ. The author of the Appeal, profeſſed to confine the debate to Scripture, interpre-

ted

ted by common ſenſe; for which purpoſe the tranſlated text, as being in general faithfully done from the original, is well adapted: but, as the learned are agreed, that there are ſome miſtakes in the tranſlation, and particularly in ſome paſſages relating to this queſtion; he cannot be juſtly blamed for acquainting the Engliſh readers with it; nay, rather it was his duty to inform them, that ſuch paſſages were either ill tranſlated, or that no ſtreſs ſhould be laid upon the preſent reading, as being ambiguous in the original. Surely, this was keeping within the bounds preſcribed; for a faulty tranſlation of Scripture, or a corrupt reading, cannot be juſtly eſteemed real Scripture. The unlearned, indeed, cannot judge, whether the author of the Appeal has done it fairly and impartially; and therefore, he has appealed to the learned, as to thoſe particulars; neither can this author prove, that he has attempted any corrections of the vulgar tranſlation, without juſt and ſufficient cauſe. It is obſervable, that there are quoted in the Appeal above four hundred texts of Scripture, and the number of texts, which he thought himſelf obliged to take notice of, as being either ill tranſlated, or doubtful in the original, are but eleven; ſo that he can

ſcarce be ſaid to have deviated frequently from the vulgar tranſlation. Neither hath he advanced his own comments and paraphraſes, without producing the evidence, on which they are founded. It may be referred to the judgment of any unprejudiced perſon, whether the whole ſtrain of the Appeal does not expreſly contradict that groundleſs inſinuation, as if the author expected his judges to believe him upon his bare word.

"But the unlearned cannot judge about interpretations of Scripture, becauſe they cannot examine the original languages, in which the Scriptures were written."

Anſ. I hope this author will allow, that a book written in a dead language may be faithfully tranſlated into another; that the ſenſe of the author may be ſo clearly delivered in the tranſlation, that a perſon unacquainted with the original, may get a competent knowledge of the ſubject matter. Upon this conceſſion, common Chriſtians may reaſonably be ſuppoſed to form a good judgment about doctrines, they are required to believe and practiſe, by the aſſiſtance of the Engliſh tranſlation, which, as to the main, is univerſally allowed to be exact. What was preached and written, for the uſe and inſtruction of the unlearned as well as

learned,

learned, may certainly be underſtood by the former, as well as latter. Let it be always remembered, that the Goſpel was preached to the poor and ignorant, from whence we may be well aſſured, it was ſuch a Goſpel, as the poor and ignorant could underſtand. Accordingly, we find that the things which Chriſt and his Apoſtles lay the main ſtreſs upon, are level to all underſtandings; they are ſo plainly, and frequently inculcated in the New Teſtament, that they cannot be diſguiſed by the worſt tranſlation of the Scriptures ever publiſhed in the Chriſtian world.

This author's book is a demonſtration of the falſhood of what he contends for, namely, that the unlearned are not ſufficient judges of controverſies about interpretations of Scripture: for he labours to prove his own interpretation of Scripture to be more rational than that of the Appellant's; which neceſſarily implies, that he expects his readers to judge, according to evidence laid before them. To profeſs to prove, that the unlearned are not ſufficient judges; and at the ſame time to write a book peculiarly deſigned for their uſe, wherein he appeals to their judgment about interpretations of Scripture, muſt neceſſarily be thought a

manifeſt inconſiſtency: the plain meaning of it is this; common Chriſtians have no right to judge about religious ſubjects, unleſs they judge, as directed by their ſuperiors.

As to the point, of the ſacred books having been carefully preſerved; it is readily granted, that this depends in ſome meaſure upon an acquaintance with hiſtorical facts, tranſacted many hundred years ago. But the circumſtances of this grand affair are ſo ordered by providence, that even unlearned Chriſtians may be enabled to ſee the evidence, when honeſtly repreſented. The argument may be urged in the following manner:

With regard to the books of the New Teſtament it is a matter of fact univerſally atteſted, that they were written in the very age in which the facts were done; and diſperſed into many hands at that very time: that theſe books, as containing authentic accounts of Chriſt and his doctrine, and the firſt ſettlement of the Chriſtian church, were received with wonderful reſpect, and read in Chriſtian aſſemblies every Lord's Day, from their firſt appearance. Farther, it is a matter of fact well atteſted, that theſe books were tranſlated into different languages, and

diſperſed

diſperſed into many different nations: that all Chriſtian writers in every age have referred to theſe books as genuine; and ſome of them have quoted great numbers of paſſages from theſe books, which, upon compariſon, are found the ſame with our Engliſh tranſlation, without any material variation: that theſe books have been conſtantly employed by the different ſects and parties, into which the Chriſtian church has been unhappily divided, to confirm their reſpective opinions; and conſequently, it was not in the power of one ſet of men to corrupt theſe books in any conſiderable degree, becauſe they would have been certainly detected and expoſed, by the other parties of the Chriſtian church.

And in fact, that theſe books have not ſuffered any important corruptions, undeniably appears from the vulgar Latin Bible of the church of Rome, which agrees with all other Bibles as to the main; ſo that any unprejudiced Chriſtians may be enabled, by reading their own Latin Teſtament, to ſee and expoſe, thoſe enormous corruptions the Papiſts have introduced into the Chriſtian church; which, I ſay, evidently demonſtrates, that the prieſts of the church of Rome did not corrupt the Scriptures, when they

they had got ſo much power in their hands for ſeveral hundred years, in this weſtern part of Europe. In truth, it was not in their power to corrupt the Scriptures, even during their moſt extenſive and prevailing tyranny, becauſe there were always ſome brave and honeſt Chriſtians and Churches, when the authority of the Pope of Rome was at its greateſt height. [See ſome Remarks upon the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the antient Churches of Piedmont. By Dr. Allix.]

Beſides, the Eaſtern Church had poſſeſſion of the Scriptures, as well as the Weſtern; and therefore, a new, or corrupted Bible, might have been confronted with copies from the Eaſtern church.

It is worth obſerving, that the governing part of the church of Rome were under no temptations to attempt an alteration in the Scriptures, as they completely gained their main purpoſe another way, by keeping the Bible in their own hands; ſo that the people had no opportunity of reading it in the vulgar tongue; by which means they as effectually ſecured their ignorance, implicit obedience, and ſpiritual ſlavery, as if they had put into their hands a corrupted Bible.

I humbly

I humbly preſume, that there is nothing in this account, but what unlearned Chriſtians are capable of underſtanding; and conſequently, they may be convinced by ſatisfactory evidence, that the ſacred books have been carefully preſerved.

Add to this, that the truth of the books of the New Teſtament is wonderfully confirmed, by the general hiſtory of the times that immediately followed their publication. It is agreed on all ſides, by Heathens and Jews, as well as Chriſtians, that there appeared ſoon after our Saviour's time an honeſt ſet of men, who would not worſhip idols, who gave up the gods of their reſpective countries for the profeſſion of chriſtianity, which required an abſolute rejection of all idolatry, though attended with the greateſt evils of this preſent life. There is ſomething more extraordinary in this amazing turn, than is commonly imagined. It is well known, that no principle more univerſally prevailed through the whole heathen world, than that all perſons were obliged to conform to the eſtabliſhed religion of the country. The philoſophers themſelves, notwithſtanding all their fine notions of one ſupreme God, of virtue, and immortality of the ſoul, not only complied with the worſhip

worſhip of gods eſtabliſhed by law, but likewiſe inculcated the ſame practice to others. When they knew God, they glorified him not as God, as the great Apoſtle juſtly obſerves. Even Socrates himſelf, whom I uſed to eſteem as the glory of the heathen world, becauſe he ſuffered for the open profeſſion of one ſupreme God, appears to have lived and died a groſs idolater. The biſhop of London, in his ſermons lately publiſhed, has ſtated the caſe of this mighty Confeſſor; who, indeed, was called upon, by public authority, for talking too freely of the gods of the country, and for teaching the youth to deſpiſe their altars: but in his defence, the great Socrates maintained before his judges, that he worſhipped the gods of his country; ſo that, notwithſtanding his belief of one ſupreme God, his practice was idolatrous. As this impious principle, namely, that it is the duty of all perſons to worſhip the gods eſtabliſhed in their reſpective countries, was deeply fixed in the minds of the heathens, by the expreſs authority of their wiſeſt men, ſupported by the intereſt of prieſts, and enforced by the power of magiſtrates; it muſt be thought a very amazing change, that a ſet of men ſhould ariſe, who acted upon a principle directly contrary;

contrary; namely, that it is a duty to reject all falſe worſhip whatſoever, though eſtabliſhed by public authority, and to profeſs and practiſe in religious matters, according to conſcience, notwithſtanding all the terrors and allurements of this preſent world. It is a matter of fact, not poſſible to be overthrown by the greateſt ſceptic upon earth, that Chriſtians acted this brave and glorious part, in obedience to the expreſs injunctions of their Lord and Maſter, Jeſus Chriſt: they thought it worth their while to part with the moſt valuable intereſts of this preſent life, and ſuffer the moſt terrible perſecutions, rather than comply with the worſhip of gods eſtabliſhed by law.—Chriſtians continued in this perſecuted ſtate, more or leſs, for the firſt 300 years, of which ſtate there are faithful accounts in the Engliſh tongue; from whence, unlearned Chriſtians may be furniſhed with arguments for the truth of Chriſtianity, without depending on the mere authority of any ſet of teachers, or any modern church whatſoever. I would recommend to unlearned Chriſtians, Cave's Primitive Chriſtianity; Echard's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory; or, Whiſton's Sacred Hiſtory of the Old and New Teſtament, from the creation of the world, till the

days

days of Conſtantine the Great. At the latter end of the laſt volume of this very uſeful work, there are excellent propoſals made; which, if ever reduced to practice, would be of admirable ſervice to learned and unlearned Chriſtians, through every part of Great Britain and Ireland, with the plantations thereunto belonging.

It is carefully to be noted, that, when the capacity of common Chriſtians is maintained to judge about religious matters, it is taken for granted, that they are ſuch perſons as are diſpoſed to exerciſe the abilities which God hath given them, upon religious ſubjects; that they will employ their reaſon with the ſame attention about the will of God, as they would naturally do upon any worldly concern. Of ſuch perſons it may be truly ſaid, that they are competent judges of all points, relating to their faith and practice.

Thus, I have ſufficiently vindicated the right and capacity of the unlearned to judge about Scripture, and interpretations of it, from the objections of this author, which, as he fairly owns, are of the ſame nature with thoſe raiſed by Papiſts on one ſide, and unbelievers on the other.

The

The enormous claims of Popery are founded upon this principle, that unlearned people cannot judge about Scripture and interpretations of it; and therefore they ought not to be truſted with the reading of it in the vulgar tongue, leſt they run the hazard of erring in the moſt material points. This, I cannot help thinking, is more conſiſtent than proteſtant popery, which in words and profeſſions allows, and contends for, a tranſlation of the Scripture into the vulgar tongue, and recommends the uſe of it to the unlearned; and at the ſame time denies them the privilege and right of forming a judgment about what they read, unleſs they happen to agree with the determination of their ſuperiors.

On the other ſide, unbelievers object, that the people can know nothing of the Scripture but what the prieſts tell them, who are hired to maintain its divine authority: that it was written in languages dead long ago, and therefore the people muſt depend upon the authority of their teachers for the faithfulneſs of the tranſlation, and likewiſe for the Scripture being tranſmitted from age to age in purity and incorruption.

The objections of theſe different adverſaries have been ſufficiently obviated, by what

I have already obſerved. The conſiſtent proteſtant and ſincere chriſtian, may be enabled to give a reaſon of the hope that is in him, without an implicit reliance upon the mere authority of any ſet of teachers, or any ſect or party whatſoever. Bleſſed be the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who has afforded ſuch evidence of his will in the moſt eſſential points, that ſincere perſons of the loweſt capacities, may determine for themſelves in religious matters, in the midſt of a divided and contentious world.

I have a right to draw a concluſion directly contrary to that of this author; namely, that the author of the Appeal to the common ſenſe of all chriſtian people has purſued the very method, by which the Goſpel was at firſt eſtabliſhed; the publication of it was a direct appeal to the underſtandings of common people, as well as the wiſe, learned, and powerful. He has *paid no popular flattery to their underſtandings*; it being neceſſarily required of all perſons, to whom any ſort of religious profeſſions is a duty, that they ſhould be able to ſee with their own eyes, what faith, worſhip, and practice the Goſpel has expreſsly appointed. Neither hath this author attempted to anſwer thoſe plain obſervations in the beginning of the Ap-

Appeal, which undeniably demonſtrate the right and duty of chriſtian people to judge for themſelves in matters of religion.

Then he goes on to obſerve: "Had he (namely, the Appellant) however confined the controverſy to the plain matter of fact, as ſet forth in the tranſlated Scriptures, admitting the original text to be thereby truly and ſufficiently expreſſed, the plain unlearned chriſtian might have been allowed his ſuffrage in the deciſion of the queſtion, and the whole controverſy been reduced to the narrow compaſs which he preſcribes: But, as he hath not been content to let the matter reſt there; ſo it is evident, the bare conſideration of the ſeveral collections of texts, mentioned by him, will not ſuffice to clear up the diſpute; for he hath plainly involved in it matters of a foreign nature; and ſuch, as plain illiterate underſtandings cannot of themſelves comprehend."

Anſ. The author of the Appeal had been long of opinion, that the Scripture doctrine of the Trinity might be rendered level to common capacities; and that it might be reduced to plain matters of fact, of which unlearned chriſtians may be as good judges as the learned. He likewiſe had it in view to put a final period, if poſſible, to this

celebrated controverſy, with which the chriſtian world has been more or leſs perplexed for ſo many hundred years. In order to attain this excellent end, he propoſed to the learned Athanaſians two large collections of texts, with obſervations naturally ariſing from them. This author is obliged to grant, that a common chriſtian might have been allowed his ſuffrage, if the original text had been admitted to have been truly tranſlated, and the whole controverſy might have been reduced to the narrow compaſs which he preſcribes. Now it plainly appears, that the difference between the original and our Engliſh tranſlation is very inconſiderable in theſe two large collections of texts. With reſpect to the firſt collection, wherein the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are mentioned together, there is only one variation taken notice of; namely, *Holy* Spirit inſtead of *eternal* Spirit. As to the famous text, 1 John v. 7. to which, I ſuppoſe, this author's words refer, I have fully conſidered every thing relating to it in the progreſs of the debate. As to the other large collection of texts, wherein the worſhip or honour due to Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, is diſtinctly ſet forth, there is but one variation, namely, Acts vii. 59. Here the Engliſh reader is given

given to underſtand, that the word, *God*, is not in the original Greek, which is a truth that this author cannot contradict. I am deeply convinced, that from theſe two large collections of texts, there naturally ariſe two deciſive facts, which effectually demoliſh the Athanaſian Trinity; and what this author has advanced to invalidate this important concluſion, ſhall be particularly conſidered in its proper place.

The Anſwerer goes on thus: "The immortal Dr. Clarke, as the Appellant calls him, hath, indeed, laid the foundation of endleſs diſputes and cavils; and the dangerous tendency of his labours, in this way, hath been long ſince detected and expoſed; yet the reputation of his miſapplied learning will get him diſciples, while men pay a greater deference to meer human compoſitions, than to the Scriptures, the true fountain of religious knowledge."

Anſ. Dr. Clarke's theological writings doubtleſs appear diſagreeable to thoſe, who are determined right or wrong to maintain articles, creeds, and ſyſtems of meer human authority, which cannot bear the teſt of Scripture interpreted by reaſon. But the writings of this extraordinary perſon are ſo far from laying the foundation of endleſs

diſputes and cavils, that they are admirably adapted to produce the contrary effect, namely, univerſal peace and harmony through the whole chriſtian world. The main view of his chriſtian labours was to repreſent the doctrines of revelation in their original ſimplicity, free from all human mixtures; and to perſuade chriſtian governors to forbear the impoſition of forms and articles, that evidently break in upon the expreſs declarations of Chriſt and his apoſtles; which practice undeniably laid the foundation of endleſs cavils and diſputes, violence and perſecution. The hiſtory of the church from the fourth century downwards, confirms the truth of this obſervation. Whereas this author affirms, that the dangerous tendency of Dr. Clarke's labours in this way has been long ſince detected and expoſed; I will venture to maintain on the other ſide, that the Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity publiſhed in 1712, has never been ſolidly confuted to this very time, notwithſtanding the many volumes that have appeared againſt it. Let it be obſerved, that I do not pretend to vindicate the third part of this excellent book, which the learned Doctor partly gave up himſelf, as incapable of defence upon chriſtian principles. Dr. Clarke's book has not only

only been of infinite ſervice to ſettle this important doctrine; but has likewiſe ſet a noble example to other chriſtian writers, to proceed upon the ſame glorious plan, and to examine other doctrines of revelation in the ſame preciſe and accurate manner. Biſhop Hoadly's Plain Account of the Lord's Supper, Mr. Taylor's Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin, and Dr. Sykes's Scripture Doctrine of the Redemption of Man by Chriſt Jeſus, may be juſtly conſidered in the ſame light with Dr. Clarke's Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity; to which I would add a very good collection of texts relating to the ſoul of man, and the ſtate of the dead, in Dr. Law's Conſiderations on the Theory of Religion. As I keep my mind open to conviction, the ſentiments which I had embraced all my rational life upon this point, may probably be changed (for I have not yet examined the queſtion to the bottom.) It is to be hoped, that the labours of theſe and many other chriſtian writers will at laſt, by the bleſſing of God, be crowned with glorious ſucceſs; that the doctrines of revelation may appear rational and conſiſtent, worthy of the God of truth from whom they came, and fit to be embraced by all ſincere lovers of truth and virtue.

As to this author's inſinuation, that I am a diſciple of Dr. Clarke, I have learned, as a chriſtian, to call no man maſter upon earth, for one is my Maſter, even Chriſt; I depend upon the abſolute authority of no man, or body of men, in matters of religious faith or practice. I eſteem the names of Luther, Calvin, and Cranmer, as perſons, to whom we are deeply obliged for the attempts they made to reſcue the chriſtian religion from Romiſh error and ſuperſtition; but I do not think myſelf under any obligation to receive implicitly whatever they have impoſed upon their followers: ſo far as their tenets appear to my underſtanding ſupported by holy Scripture, I readily give my aſſent; and ſo far as they are not ſo, I am as much juſtified in rejecting them, as they were in laying aſide the groſs errors of Popery, in which they had been educated. Neither do I ſubſtitute the names of Newton, Clarke, Whiſton, or Locke, in the room of our firſt reformers: I embrace them as helps, as fellow-ſervants; but I follow none of them as infallible guides; the Scripture only is truly entitled to this glorious character. When any of my fellow-ſervants offers an interpretation of Scripture, which carries reaſon and conviction with it, I thankfully receive it,

it, not becauſe it comes recommended with ſome illuſtrious name, but becauſe I ſee the evidence on which it is founded; in which caſe it is as much my own, as if I had diſcovered it by my own abilities. I am obliged to an honeſt and ſkilful interpreter for enabling me to perceive the mind of Chriſt more clearly and diſtinctly, than otherwiſe I ſhould have done. But my faith is determined by the authority of Chriſt, whom I acknowledge as my only Maſter in ſpiritual affairs.

As to this author's obſervation, that Dr. Clarke will have diſciples, while men pay a greater deference to meer human compoſitions, than to the Scriptures, the true fountain of religious knowledge: I anſwer, whoſoever reads Dr. Clarke's theological writings with an unprejudiced mind, will naturally judge, that this extraordinary perſon never aimed at being the head of a party; he never wrote in ſuch a way, as if he wanted to make diſciples to himſelf, but earneſtly exhorted chriſtian profeſſors of every denomination to adhere cloſely to the authority of their Lord and Maſter Jeſus Chriſt; to form their opinions and religious practices by the rule of Scripture, and not venture beyond what was clearly determined by Chriſt and

his apoſtles. I very much queſtion, whether there ever was a writer ſince the days of the apoſtles, in whoſe works can be found more judicious collections of texts of Scripture, than in the valuable labours of this extraordinary man. I appeal to his Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, and eleven volumes of ſermons, for the truth of this obſervation.

In the next paragraph, this author pretends that it is highly probable the Appellant would not have entered the liſts with ſuch great men as Potter and Waterland, if they had been now alive, who had already ſo eminently foiled the ableſt abettors of the ſame cauſe.

Anſ. The Appellant's view was to explain an important ſubject for the benefit of common chriſtians; and at the ſame time to give as little offence as poſſible to the learned in the management of it: and this he certainly would have done, if thoſe great men had been alive. I muſt beg leave to aſſert on one ſide, as this author has done on the other, namely, that Potter was eminently foiled in point of argument by Biſhop Hoadly and Dr. Sykes, and Waterland by Dr. Clarke, Dr. Whitby, and Mr. Jackſon; to whom I add Mr. Whiſton, who addreſſed

a little piece to Dr. Waterland, which the Doctor never anſwered. As to this author's cenſure of my inſinuation, that Potter and Waterland were of a perſecuting ſpirit, the latter openly profeſſed it in his Importance of the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and plainly ſhewed his diſpoſition to perſecute, if he could have prevailed upon the civil power to have granted him a *competent authority*; which Potter too would have gladly exerciſed, if it had been in his power. The conduct of the Appellant ſhall be explained in its proper place.

With reſpect to the Holy Spirit being an angel, the Appellant has produced ſome additional arguments in confirmation of the general ſcheme of the learned author of the Eſſay on Spirit. But he has not delivered his ſentiments upon this point in a poſitive manner; he is willing to be ſet right in any matter great or ſmall; and therefore he fairly acknowledges, that he was not acquainted with the different reading that this author rightly takes notice of, verſe 39th of Acts viii. Some copies, I find, read the words thus; *the Holy Spirit fell upon the eunuch, but the angel of the Lord caught away Philip*, which ſeem to diſtinguiſh the Holy Spirit from the angel of the Lord. If I had known this

this various reading, I would not have made uſe of it to prove the point I had in view. However this author allows, that the ſame perſon who is ſtiled angel of the Lord, verſe 26. is called Spirit, verſe 29. but not the Holy Spirit. Now it plainly appears from many inſtances, that the Holy Spirit is ſtiled the Spirit: and as many copies read the words of the 39th verſe according to our Engliſh tranſlation, I cannot help thinking this the moſt probable reading. But no perſon has a right to quote a doubtful text, as clear and certain; and therefore this author himſelf is ſelf-condemned, when he blames the Appellant for informing his chriſtian readers what he thought the right of the caſe, with reſpect to our Engliſh tranſlation, when not agreeable to the original; and does not he attempt to ſet his readers right, with regard to a ſeeming fault in our Engliſh tranſlations? Doubtleſs, if we act upon a proteſtant or chriſtian principle, we ought to acquaint unlearned chriſtians with the exact ſtate of the caſe in all points, where their faith and practice are immediately concerned.

Again, I argued in the Appeal, that the angel ſent to good Cornelius was probably the Holy Spirit. The perſon, who ſent the

meſſengers, is called an angel of God, verſe 5. and the perſon, who is ſtiled the Spirit, expreſsly declares to St. Peter, I have ſent them, namely, the meſſengers of Cornelius; and therefore I inferred, that the angel who appeared and ſpake to Cornelius, was the ſame perſon who ſpake to Peter, and is ſtiled the Spirit. But how does it follow, that they are evidently diſtinct perſons, becauſe, according to the obſervation of this author, it is intimated, verſe 4. that the angel was ſent on that meſſage from God? As the angel of the Lord ordered Cornelius to ſend meſſengers to Joppa, he might properly be ſaid to ſend the meſſengers; the ſame individual act being applied to the angel of the Lord and the Spirit, makes it highly probable, that the ſame perſon is denoted by the two different appellations, which probability is not leſſened by the notion of the angel being ſent from God to deliver a meſſage to Cornelius. I refer this author to the 2d edition of the Appeal, where this point, namely, that the Holy Spirit is an angel, is farther confirmed and illuſtrated, p. 66——71.

24 OC 62

A

TABLE

OF THE

CONTENTS.

AN account of the principles of chriſtianity, wherein the Appellant and his Opponent are agreed. page 2

Chriſtians may juſtly reject the Athanaſian creed, as being confeſſedly unſcriptural. 3, 4

The two different manners, wherein the queſtion is propoſed in the Appeal cleared up in anſwer to objections. 5

The plain and literal ſenſe of the unity of God, defended againſt objections. 12

Our Saviour's declarations ſetting forth his inferiority to the Father, defended againſt objections. 20

Chriſt's inferiority to God ſet forth in the Acts of the apoſtles, Epiſtles, and Revelation, defended againſt objections. 46

The title of God aſcribed to Chriſt conſidered, and ſhewn to be conſiſtent with the unity of God. 59, 135

The titles of Alpha and Omega, the firſt and the laſt, conſidered. 165

His

His being one with the Father. page 166

The title of Lord God Almighty which is, and which was, and which is to come, ſuppoſed to be aſcribed to Chriſt, obviated, and ſome paſſages in Revelation relative to it, conſidered. 171

The attributes of omniſcience, eternity, omnipreſence, immutability, conſidered. 182

Creation and preſervation conſidered. 200

The Athanaſian account of Chriſt's incarnation fully anſwered. 217

The uſual texts brought to prove the ſupreme divinity of the Spirit, fully conſidered. 227

What has been urged againſt the argument advanced in the Appeal, drawn from all the texts, where the three perſons of the Trinity are mentioned together, fully anſwered. 262

The faith declared in Scripture to be neceſſary to ſalvation, defended againſt objections. 266, 287

The determination of the Appeal with regard to the firſt queſtion ſhewn to be fixed upon a ſolid foundation. 293

As to the ſecond queſtion, or the article of worſhip, it is ſhewn that the worſhip of one God does not ſignify a worſhip paid to three perſons. 297

The worſhip paid to Chriſt in the New Teſtament proved to be of an inferior nature, and every objection to it fully anſwered. 298

No direct worſhip paid to the Holy Spirit in the New Teſtament; what has been alledged to prove it, diſtinctly conſidered. 320

Not the leaſt colour of evidence in Scripture for the worſhip of a conſubſtantial Trinity. 338

The

The celebrated argument of the learned Athanaſians drawn from the article of worſhip, reviewed and fully anſwered. page 340

Dr. M'Donnell's addreſs to his chriſtian readers, with reſpect to the clergy, a propoſal for an impartial diſcuſſion of the Appellant's arguments, a general proteſt of chriſtian people, the conduct of the Appellant, the hiſtory of the church in the 4th and 5th centuries, the common rights of chriſtian people, the church of Rome and Mahometan religion, the exhortations of the Appellant to piety and virtue, Chriſt's ſatisfaction, hell torments, reformation of the church, diſtinctly conſidered. 352

General obſervations upon the ſtate of the trinitarian controverſy. 398

Some account of the ſchiſm between the eaſtern and weſtern church with regard to the proceſſion of the Holy Spirit. 407

An attempt to put a final period to this controverſy by a ſolemn appeal to the moſt judicious defenders of the Athanaſian cauſe with regard to two Scripture arguments which may be juſtly eſteemed deciſive, if not diſtinctly anſwered. 412

The New Teſtament examined with a view to the controverted point of the civil eſtabliſhment of religion, &c. 418

The whole concluded with a ſolemn proteſt againſt the Athanaſian forms, and the authority by which they were firſt eſtabliſhed, and are now ſupported. 424

A diſſertation on the famous text, 1 *John* v. 7. 431

24 OC 62

AN

INDEX

OF THE

TEXTS Cited or Explained.

GENESIS.

Chap.	Verse	Page
xxvii	28	176
xxviii	3	ib.
xxxi	38	199

EXODUS.

iii	14	169
xiv	31	31. 269. 273
xx	3	347. 351
xxiv	10	173
xxxii	7	254
ib.	11	ib.
xxxiv	33, 34	258

DEUTERONOMY.

vi	4	35
xxxii	39	213
ib.	43	346

JUDGES

ii	1	108
iii	9	304

II. SAMUEL

INDEX of the TEXTS.

II SAMUEL.

CHAP.	VERSE	PAGE
xiv	20	79

I KINGS

xxii	19	301

II KINGS

xiii	5	304

I CHRONICLES

xxix	20	273, 274

NEHEMIAH

ix	27	304

JOB.

v	14	116
x	10	ib.
xi	12	ib.
xiii	12. 20	ib.
xv	16	ib.
xxiv	20	ib.
xxvii	16	ib.
xxviii	2	ib.
xxix	14	ib.
xxxviii	7	68
xl	15	116

N. B. These texts, quoted from Job, refer to the Septuagint.

PSALMS

xlv	6	111, 112
ib.	7	93
ib.	8	89
xciv	10	190
xcvii	7	346
cii	25, &c.	194. 203
cx	1	34

INDEX of the TEXTS.

ISAIAH.

CHAP.	VERSE	PAGE
vi	3	174
ib.	5	172, 173
ib.	9, 10	
xxv	9	98
xl	3. 9	ib.
ib.	14	101
xlii	8	20. 346. 350
xliv	24	211
xlviii	11, 12	346
li	23	116
liii	6. 10	99
liv	5. 13	98, 99
lxi	1	102

JEREMIAH.

vii	22	238

EZEKIEL.

xx	25	238
xxxix	17, 18, 19, 20	53

DANIEL.

vii	14	111. 351
ix	21	223

HOSEA.

vi	6	238

JOEL.

ii	17	317

ZECHARIAH.

iv	2. 6. 9, 10	173
xii	5. 10	172, 173, 174
xiii	7. 9	
xiv	5. 9	36
ib.	3. 5. 7. 9. 12, 13. 16. 18. 20, 21	36

INDEX of the TEXTS.

MALACHI.

CHAP.	VERSE	PAGE
ii	7	273
iii	1	46. 48, 49
iv	5	46. 48
ib.	6	48

WISDOM.

vii	1. 3. Septuagint	116

TOBIT.

xii	15	176, 273

MATTHEW.

i	23	98
ib.	25	120
iii	17	451
iv	10	6. 294. 347
v	14	148
ib.	31	124
vii	16	383
ib.	21	59. 295
x	40	62
xi	10	49
xii	31, 32	252
xv	24	238
xviii	20	194. 196
xix	16, 17	12
xxii	42, 43	89
xxiii	9, 10	418
xxiv	8, 21	120
ib.	25	74
ib.	25. 30. 31	ib.
ib.	36	75
xxv	31, &c.	46, 51
xxvi	26	
ib.	39	225
ib.	39. 42, 44	82
xxvii	36	73
ib.	46	82
xxviii	18, 19	262 264

INDEX of the TEXTS.

MARK.

CHAP.	VERSE	PAGE
i	1	120
ib.	2	49
iv	15	197
v	7	47
x	6	120
xii	29, 32	34
ib.	29	34. 163, 164
ib.	36	34
xiii	8, 19	120
ib.	14, 26	74
ib.	32	73. 75
xvi	12	115
ib.	15	217
ib.	19	310

LUKE.

i	17	49
ib.	19	176
ib.	32	47
ib.	33, 32	111, 112
ib.	35	47, 68
ib.	47	304
ib.	68. 76.	45. 47, 47, 48
ii	7	120
ib.	52	193
iii	21, 22	196
ib.	38	68
vi	12	82
ib.	35	47
vii	27	49
viii	28	47
ix	18. 28, 29	82
ib.	26	268
x	16	240
xi	1, 2	82
xx	36	68
xxii	27	115
ib.	41, 42. 44	82
xxiii	34	303
ib.	34. 46	82

JOHN.

CHAP.	VERSE	PAGE
i	1	135, 136. 163. 168. 194
ib.	2	
ib.	1, 2	69
ib.	3	200, 211
ib.	1. 3. 18	381
ib.	4. 9	149
ib.	4	122. 158
ib.	14, 18	69. 219
ib.	17	18
ib.	18	50. 317
ib.	32	196
ii	11	120
ib.	24	184
iii	8	324
ib.	13	198, 199
ib.	16	19
ib.	31	45, 47
ib.	34	47
iv	24	57
v	17	66. 70
ib.	19	66, 67
ib.	20	11, 12, 13
ib.	22	124, 343
ib.	23	342, 343
ib.	26	158
ib.	30	65. 67. 70
ib.	37	256. 450
vi	37, 38, 39, 40	60
ib.	44	187
ib.	45	99
ib.	56	140
vii	16, 17, 18	60
viii	17, 18	454, 456
ib.	18	450, 454
ib.	28	101
ib.	42	79, 408
ib.	54	294
ix	25	198
x	7	

JOHN.

CHAP.	VERSE	PAGE
x	15	191
ib.	18	71, 72
ib.	24, 25. 138	
ib.	29	87. 137
ib.	27, 28, 29	138
ib.	30	137. 140. 142. 381. 436. 439. 452
ib.	34	68
ib.	30. 25	
ib.	29. 36	137
ib.	24. 27	138
ib.	27, 28, 29	ib.
ib.	29	87
ib.	28. 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38	139, 140
xi	15	129
ib.	16, 17, 18	129, 130
ib.	25	158
xii	27	86
ib.	41	172, 173
ib.	49, 50	71
xiv	1, 3	131
ib.	9	199
ib.	10	140
ib.	10, 11	147
ib.	16	82. 168
ib.	10. 20	140. 147
ib.	23	129
ib.	28	87
ib.	31	71
xv	1	
ib:	3	131, 132
ib.	4	141
ib.	10	71
ib.	15	80
ib.	26	168. 407. 450
xvi	7, 8. 13	168
ib.	12	77
ib.	13, 14, 15	185

INDEX of the TEXTS.

JOHN.

CHAP.	VERSE	PAGE
xvi	17, 18	78
ib.	28	195
ib.	30	76, 77, 78, 79. 184
xvii	1, 2, 3	
ib.	3	28. 159
ib.	10	186, 187
ib.	11, 21	141. 146
ib.	22, 23	139. 141
ib.	26	141
ib.	18, 19	
ib.	29, 30	
xix	34. 37	172, 173
xx	17	8
ib.	28	151, 152
ib.	29	152
ib.	31	153
xxi	17	76, 77. 80

ACTS.

i	24	298
ii	22	91
ib.	32	88. 93
ib.	33, 34. 36	43. 91. 96
ib.	36	50. 93. 96
ib.	39	95
iii	13	97
iv	19, 20	419
ib.	24. 29, 30	97
v	3, 4	236. 242
ib.	30	305
vii	35	310
ib.	59	298, 299
ib.	60	302
x	36	45, 46. 96.
ib.	38	56
ib.	42	46. 51
xiii	2	306. 327
ib.	33	69
xv	24	408

INDEX of the TEXTS.

ACTS.

CHAP.	VERSE	PAGE
xvii	11	82
ib.	23 to 31	102, 107
ib.	31	122. 161
xx	21	49. 106
ib.	21. 27, 28.	107
ib.	28	109
xxii	14. 16, 17	304, 305
xxiii	9	239
xxiv	14	305
xxviii	23	254
ib.	25, 26, 27	253

ROMANS.

i	4	69
ib.	25	155. 162. 164
ii	17	156
ib.	35, 36	406
vi	3	269
viii	14	68
ib.	29	120
ix	1	328
ib.	5	154, 156
xi	35	
ib.	35, 36	
xiv	10, 11, 12	51
xv	6	10
xvi	25, 26	284
ib.	27	286. 307

I CORINTHIANS.

i	12, 13	270
ib.	15	ib.
ii	10, 11	229. 231
iii	8	139
ib.	16	243
vi	11. 14	247
ib.	19, 20	245
vii	22, 23, 24	ib.
viii	5, 6	31. 34

INDEX of the TEXTS.

I CORINTHIANS.

Chap.	Verse	Page
viii	6	122. 200
x	2	268
xi	3	109
ib.	35, 36	72
xii	3	122
ib.	4, 5, 6	40
ib.	27, 28	44. 108
ib.	6	323
ib.	8	ib.
ib.	11	322
xv	24	10. 111
ib.	24. 27, 28	110, 111

II CORINTHIANS.

i	3	10
ib.	9	213
iii	6	260
ib.	13	258. 260
ib.	14	258
ib.	16	
ib.	17, 18	257. 259. 261
v	17	217
vi	16	242
viii	9	199
xi	31	10
xiii	14	324

GALATIANS.

i	4	10
ib.	8, 9	418
ib.	15	306
iii	19	201
ib.	27	269
iv	4	220
ib.	8	162. 164
vi	15	217

INDEX of the TEXTS.

EPHESIANS.

CHAP.	VERSE	PAGE
i	3	10
ib.	9	285
ib.	10	
ib.	20, 21, 22	50
ii	10. 15	217
ib.	14, 15, 16, 17	248
ib.	18	247
ib.	19, 20	249
ib.	21, 22	247. 249, 250
iii	3. 6. 9.	285
ib.	9	136. 200. 217
ib.	11	161
ib.	18, 19	208
ib.	21	161
iv	4, 5, 6	36. 292
ib.	11	41
v	20	10
ib.	32, 33	110

PHILIPPIANS.

ii	6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11	112. 119
ib.	9, 10, 11	310. 349
iv	15	120
ib.	20	10

COLOSSIANS.

i	3	10
ib.	1, 2, 3. 15. 27.	
ib.	9. 10. 18	
ib.	15	50. 115. 119. 194. 207
ib.	16, 17	121. 210. 214
ib.	18	120. 123. 207
ib.	16, 17	210
ib.	19	207
ib.	26, 27	285
ii	2	9, 10
iii	10	217
ib.	17	10

INDEX of the TEXTS.

I THESSALONIANS.

CHAP.	VERSE	PAGE
i	3	10
ib.	9	161
iii	11	10
iv	8	241

II THESSALONIANS.

i	4	161
ii	16	10

I TIMOTHY.

i	1	303
ib.	12	ib.
ib.	17	306, 307
iii	1	177
ib.	3	223. 304
ib.	7	329
iii	16	157
iv	10	304
v	21	271. 416
vi	16	46. 49

II TIMOTHY.

ii	7	79

TITUS.

i	3	304
ii	10	ib.
iii	4. 6	ib.

HEBREWS.

i	2	136. 199, 200
ib.	3	115. 210. 214, 215
ib.	3. 6	310
ib.	4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9	154. 201
ib.	5, 6	201
ib.	6	120. 346. 349
ib.	8	111. 153

INDEX of the TEXTS.

HEBREWS.

CHAP.	VERSE	PAGE
i	4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9	201
ib.	8, 9. 12	
ib.	10	194
ib.	10, 11, 12	199, 200
ib.	12	203
ib.	13	201
ii	4	456
ib.	13	
ib.	14. 17, 18	221, 222
iii.	3	18
ib.	3, 4, 5, 6	204
ib.	6	69
ib.	14	120
v	7	82
ib.	12	120
vi	1	ib.
vii	3	ib.
ix	14	282
x	5	220
xi	28	120
xii	2	119
ib.	22	127
ib.	23	120
xiii	8	203

JAMES.

i	18	217
ib.	27	10
iii	9	ib.

I PETER.

i	3	10, 19
ib.	20, 21	159
iii	22	310

II PETER.

i	21	256
iii	4	120

INDEX of the TEXTS.

I JOHN.

CHAP.	VERSE	PAGE
i	2	150. 168
ib.	3. 5, 6	149, 150
ib.	5	148
ib.	18	128. 313
ib.	7	150
ii	27	79
ib.	19	408
iii	1, 5	108
ib.	24	141. 243
iv	1, 2, 3. 15	379. 381
ib.	9	161
ib.	13	243
ib.	15, 16	141
v	1	460
ib.	6	ib.
ib.	7	431
ib.	7, 8, 9, 10, 11	459
ib.	20, 11, 12, 13	158, 159

II JOHN.

	9	159

JUDE.

	25	304

REVELATION.

i	1	169. 187. 192
ib.	4	46. 171, 172. 175. 177. 273.
ib.	5	120. 416
ib.	6	10
ib.	7	170. 272
ib.	8	50. 199
ib.	11	
ib.	11. 17	165
ib.	18	126. 128. 313. 315
ii	1	

INDEX of the TEXTS.

REVELATION.

CHAP.	VERSE	PAGE
ii	1	
ib.	11. 29	
ib.	23	184
iii	1	175
ib.	13, 14	
ib.	14	119, 220
ib.	17	123
ib.	21	50. 124. 334
iv	2, 3	124, 125
ib.	5	175
ib.	8	172. 174
ib.	9	174
ib.	10	
ib.	11	57, 297
v	2, 3, 4	
ib.	6	124, 125. 175
ib.	6. 9, 10	175
ib.	6. 13	312, 333
ib.	8	126
ib.	6. 8. 11, 12, 13	180. 314
ib.	6, 7. 9, 10. 13	125. 175
ib.	6, 7. 13, 14	174
ib.	7. 13, 14	128
ib.	8, 9, &c.	127
ib.	9	192. 311
ib.	9, 10	
ib.	9. 12, 13, 14	127, 128. 312, 313
ib.	13	341
vii	9, 10, 11, 12	126, 127, 128
ib.	15. 17	129
viii	2	175
xi	15, 16, 17, 18	127. 129, 130
ib.	17	172
xii	9	197
xiv	1	131
ib.	3	127, 131
xv	2	127
ib.	3	126. 131, 132
ib.	5, 6, 7	175

REVE-

INDEX of the TEXTS.

REVELATION.

CHAP.	VERSE	PAGE
xvi	1	175
ib.	5	172
xvii	1	175
ib.	14	50
xix	7, 8, 9	52
ib.	11, 12, 15	52, 53
ib.	9, 16, 17	46. 51, 52
ib.	16	50. 52
xx	2, 3	
ib.	11, &c.	124
ib.	11, 12	46. 51. 124
xxi	9	175
xxii	1, 3	124. 126
ib.	3	127
ib.	12. 7	124. 128

TEXTS regarding a Moral Creation by CHRIST, added after the whole was finiſhed.

EPHES. iii. 9. compared with ii. 10. 15.—GALAT. vi. 15.—2 COR. v. 17.—COLOS. iii. 10.—JAM. i. 18. —MARK xvi. 15. *See Page* 597.

24 OC 62

N. B. *When Dr.* Mc Donnell's *Words are cited in the following Treatiſe, the beginning and end are marked thus:* " - - - "

TO THE

Rev. Thomas McDonnell, D.D.

REVEREND SIR,

I HAVE carefully examined your Anſwer to the Appeal to the Common Senſe of all Chriſtian People, with a mind open to conviction, and a ſincere reſolution to retract any errors I might have been guilty of, in that little piece, deſigned for the uſe of common Chriſtians.

As we both profeſs ourſelves Diſciples of the bleſſed Jeſus, and, conſequently, under the higheſt obligations to promote pure and genuine Chriſtianity, as it was left by himſelf and his Apoſtles; ſo it is our indiſpenſible duty, as Chriſtians, to promote this cauſe in the ſpirit of peace and charity; to make all candid allowances for each other's miſtakes and difference of ſentiments; it being reaſonable to expect, that men will entertain variety of opinions upon religious ſubjects, as well as others, for which inconvenience the Goſpel has provided no other remedy, but mutual kindneſs and forbearance. Let us therefore carefully avoid all ſuch methods in the management of this de-

bate, as are inconſiſtent with our outward profeſſions; leſt, by a contrary practice, to which controverſial writers have been too often obnoxious, we hurt the common cauſe of Chriſtianity, and expoſe it to the ſcoffs of profane and ſceptical men.

Having thus premiſed our mutual obligations, which naturally ariſe from our mutual profeſſions, I ſhall firſt conſider how far we are agreed in the general principles of Chriſtianity, before I enter upon a particular diſcuſſion of thoſe points wherein we differ.

I. We are agreed, that the Scripture is the rule of faith and practice; and that every true rational Chriſtian hath a right to look into Scripture himſelf, and from thence to infer the meaſure of his faith, and the rule of his religious duty.

II. We are agreed, that no Church hath a right to impoſe doctrines not clearly revealed in Scripture; and that we are not to underſtand the word of God in every part, merely according to the letter, but according to the general ſenſe and plain connexion of each correſponding part. Let a few inſtances be produced: *This is my Body*; *I am a Door*; *I am a Vine*; neceſſarily require a departure from the literal ſenſe.

III. We ſeem agreed, that the Unity of God is a fundamental principle of revealed religion.

IV. We are agreed, that Chriſt is our only mediator, and interceſſor with the Father, and that he will come with power and glory to judge the quick and dead: and that the Holy Spirit is a perſon diſtinct from the Father and the Son; that he inſpired the Prophets and Apoſtles in their greater work, and that he aſſiſts good perſons in the diſcharge of their duty.

V. We

V. We are agreed, that the direct worſhip of Chriſt is warranted by Scripture.

VI. We are, I hope, agreed, that the doctrine of Chriſt is principally deſigned to promote the practice of univerſal righteouſneſs and holineſs.

As we are agreed in theſe important articles, one would naturally think, that we might eaſily adjuſt this famous controverſy to mutual ſatisfaction. I ſhall endeavour not to be wanting on my part to accompliſh this bleſſed work: In order to which, I ſhall conſider every material article you have advanced, not like a pleader, but a ſincere enquirer after truth; as being determined to keep my eye conſtantly fixed upon the grand rule we profeſs to follow, namely, the ſincere Word of God, and to write with a view to that tremendous time, when we muſt all appear before the judgment ſeat of Chriſt.

Your firſt obſervation is, that I have been *too haſty in cenſuring the doctrine of the Athanaſian Creed*; "For though, as you are obliged to grant, the very expreſs words of Scripture, are perhaps not to be found in that Creed; yet this, it ſhould ſeem, ought not to be ſufficient to condemn it, unleſs it alſo evidently contradicts the connected ſenſe and plain tenour of thoſe ſacred writings: The queſtion, therefore is, whether that Creed contains the true doctrine of the Scriptures, according to their true ſenſe and meaning?" Page 2.

Anſ. I hope it will be granted on all ſides, that the doctrine of the Trinity is a matter of mere revelation, not derived from the principles of reaſon, but owes all its ſupport to the Word of God. Now the declarations of the Athanaſian Creed, when compared with thoſe of Scripture, are ſo far from being found there, that they ſeem at firſt view

to convey a ſenſe in oppoſition to that of the ſacred writers. There are ſeveral propoſitions in this famous Creed, that appear ſhocking to common ſenſe, and ſeem contradictory to each other, as well as Scripture. The language of the New Teſtament upon the ſubject of the Trinity, conveys a clear, rational, and conſiſtent ſenſe: But the ſame doctrine, as ſet forth in the Athanaſian Creed, is all confuſion and ſelf-inconſiſtency; and, conſequently, a Chriſtian can be under no obligation to expreſs his faith in ſuch contradictory and unſcriptural expreſſions, which do not ſeem calculated to clear up a Scripture doctrine, but to darken and confound the faith once delivered to the Saints. I muſt beg leave to remind you, that it is not conſiſtent with the character of a ſincere Chriſtian to contend for the impoſition of ſuch a Creed upon the conſciences of Chriſtians, as it is evidently needleſs from your own conceſſion, namely, that the expreſſions in it are not found in Scripture. Can a ſincere Chriſtian poſſibly think, that a doctrine of revelation can be better expreſſed by men fallible, intereſted, and contentious, than by the Apoſtles themſelves, to whom it was revealed by the Spirit of God, and who *alone* had a commiſſion from God to deliver it to mankind whole and undefiled? Is not this in effect to declare, that the language of the Holy Spirit was inſufficient to ſet forth a doctrine fully and completely, without the aſſiſtance of new and obſcure terms of art, invented by men? Though a Chriſtian has certainly a right to reject ſuch an unſcriptural Creed, without a formal examination; yet I am willing to give it all the fair play its warmeſt advocates can deſire. Let it not be abſolutely rejected, unleſs it contradicts Scripture in ſenſe as well as language.

As

As to the ſtate of the queſtion, you obſerve, "That, in the two different manners of ſtating it, I have confounded the terms Intelligent Agent and Perſon, as well as the terms, Eſſence, and Subſtance, in the firſt manner. That God is an intelligent Agent, is obvious to ſenſe and reaſon; but that he is a Perſon, that is, a certain individual intelligent Agent, diſtinguiſhed by peculiar properties from all other individuals of the ſame kind; which is the conſtantly known and allowed ſenſe of this term, cannot, with any truth or propriety, be ſaid of God taken abſolutely; of the ſame kind, or nature, with whom no other exiſtence can be conceived: And that the terms, Eſſence and Subſtance, bear quite diſtinct ſignifications, has been elſewhere ſhewn."

Anſ. The queſtion propoſed in the firſt manner, was this: Whether the one God ſignifies one ſupreme intelligent Agent, or Perſon, one ſupreme Lord and Governor; or whether it ſignifies three ſupreme intelligent Agents, or Perſons, united in one eſſence, or ſubſtance. Intelligent Agent and Perſon, according to common ſenſe and language, neceſſarily denote the ſame thing; and therefore, if God be an intelligent Agent, he is certainly a Perſon, not indeed diſtinguiſhed from other individuals of the ſame kind, which cannot be ſaid of God, and which does not convey the preciſe idea of a Perſon. A Perſon ſignifies a Being, or Agent, endued with mind, or underſtanding. Thus a man is a Perſon; an Angel is a Perſon; Chriſt is a Perſon; and God is a Perſon *. When

* A Perſon, to ſpeak in the language of grammarians, is expreſſed in Greek and Latin, by a maſculine adjective, placed abſolutely without any antecedent ſubſtantive.

we uſe the word, *he*, in Engliſh, we always mean an intelligent Agent, or Being, that is, a Perſon. When, therefore, you maintain, that God taken abſolutely, cannot be ſaid to be a Perſon, you introduce nothing but confuſion: For God is always deſcribed by the ſacred writers, as a Perſon. Let one of your texts be produced; *Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and* him *only ſhalt thou ſerve*; it is impoſſible that God in this text ſhould ſignify any thing elſe but a Perſon, and likewiſe one Perſon, which the word, *him*, neceſſarily denotes. When in my ſtate of the queſtion, I deſcribed God as one intelligent Agent, or Perſon, I expreſſed it according to common ſenſe and language, which, in this inſtance, you have laboured to confound. There is exactly the ſame reaſon for aſcribing perſonality to God, abſolutely taken, as there is to Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, which you are obliged to grant: You cannot produce one argument to prove the perſonality of the Father, that may not be urged with equal advantage, to prove that God abſolutely taken, is a Perſon. When you ſpeak of God being an intelligent Agent, and at the ſame time deny him to be a Perſon, you talk in a language not poſſible to be underſtood. Your anſwer is profeſſedly deſigned for the uſe of common Chriſtians; but you take a very improper method to inſtruct them, by amuſing them with ſubtle diſtinctions, which the learned themſelves, with all their refinements, cannot explain conſiſtently with the principles of common ſenſe, and common language. Again, whether the terms Eſſence, and Subſtance, have the ſame ſignification, or whether they ſignify different things, I think of little importance, and not worth a particular diſcuſſion. It is high time that all ſuch metaphyſical

taphyſical terms ſhould be baniſhed from Chriſtian profeſſions, and Chriſtian debates.

As to my ſecond manner of ſtating the queſtion, you obſerve that, "I ſeem to take it for granted, that wherever God is called the Father, thereby is particularly meant the Father of our Lord Jeſus; whereas it is evident that God Almighty is frequently called, the Father, and our Father, as being the Father of all his Creatures, which we are given to underſtand, he is in a quite different manner from that, whereby he is the Father of our Lord. And therefore, where the expreſſion the Father of our Lord, is added to the term God, or the context requires it to be ſo underſtood, there the Perſon only of the Father of our Lord is particularly intended, to whom, by way of eminence, as being firſt in order in the bleſſed Trinity, the appellation of God is generally given."

Anſ. My ſecond manner of ſtating the queſtion is this; whether the one God be the Father only, or whether the one God, ſignifies Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt? It muſt be referred to the judgment of all unprejudiced perſons, whether I have not ſtated the queſtion fairly and clearly. I really took it for granted, that God, when he is called the Father, is the ſame Perſon who is ſtyled in other paſſages the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, as thinking it impoſſible that any ſincere Chriſtian ſhould take it otherwiſe. But I find myſelf miſtaken: What you mean, when compared with other expreſs declarations of your anſwer, and reduced to plain language, is evidently this; God, when he is called the Father, or our Father, ſtrictly means Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; but God, when ſtyled the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, or when the context neceſſarily

determines it to this ſenſe, points out the Perſon of the Father; ſo that, when we uſe the Lord's Prayer, we muſt, according to this ſenſe, interpret our Father, as ſignifying Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. Again, when our Lord declares after his reſurrection, John xx. 17. *I aſcend to my Father and your Father, and to my God and your God:* He intends by *my Father*, the firſt Perſon of the Trinity, and by *your Father*, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. When a controverſy is reduced to this, it is high time it ſhould be ended: When learned men in defiance to the cleareſt light, and to all common ſenſe, interpret the plain declarations of the Goſpel, in ſuch an infinitely abſurd ſenſe, it is extremely proper, that common Chriſtians, who are unacquainted with the nice diſtinctions of learned men, ſhould be called upon to give their judgment, who after all may poſſibly be better judges for that very reaſon, becauſe they have no learning. Bull, Pearſon, and Waterland, never carried the doctrine ſo far this: It muſt be owned that the orthodox faith in your hands, has received the utmoſt improvement it is capable of, to which nothing can be added.

As your anſwer entirely depends upon this new interpretation, I ſhall carefully examine all the evidence you have produced in its ſupport.

I. You obſerve, "That God Almighty when called the Father, and our Father, plainly ſignifies that he is the Father of all his creatures, in a different manner from that, whereby he is the Father of our Lord." *Anſ.* Undoubtedly he is ſo; God is the Father of Chriſt in an higher and more eminent ſenſe, than he is the Father of Men and Angels. But how does it follow from hence, that the Father of Chriſt, and the Father of Men

and

and Angels, are two diſtinct Beings, which your interpretation neceſſarily implies? Two diſtinct Beings, I ſay, for I muſt inſiſt upon it, that the Father of Chriſt is one Being, and God conſiſting of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, is another Being: If this argument has any weight in it, it will prove God to be as many different Beings, as you can find different relations. He is the Father of Chriſt in one ſenſe, the Father of Angels in another, and the Father of Men in another: but ſurely, common ſenſe is ſufficient to convince every unprejudiced Chriſtian, that the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, is the ſame Perſon, or Being, who is in other paſſages ſtiled the Father, our Father, the one God and Father of all, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named.

II. But your main argument to ſhew, "That God cannot be taken abſolutely and perſonally at the ſame time, depends upon Coloſs. ii. 2; where if the term, God, be taken both ways at the ſame time, it muſt unavoidably mean a diſtinct Perſon from, either the Father, or Chriſt; the copulative *and*, denoting as plainly ſomething different in the term Father, from what is intended in the term, God, as the repetition of the ſame copulative denotes ſomething in the term Chriſt, from what is contained in either of the foregoing terms, Father, or God; but this cannot be the true interpretation, unleſs you allow the firſt term, God, to mean the Holy Spirit; and then it is plain the term cannot be taken abſolutely; but if you do not, it cannot on the other hand be taken perſonally; but muſt abſolutely mean the entire Godhead, diſtributively, and equally extended to both Father and Son."

Anſ.

Anſ. What I would firſt obſerve is, that, unleſs the ſenſe you have given to this expreſſion, be *neceſſarily* right, your main foundation is overthrown; you cannot produce one clear undoubted paſſage in the whole New Teſtament, where the word, God, *neceſſarily* conveys the idea of Father and Son, or Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. Now that this paſſage, Coloſs. ii. 2. *To the acknowledgment of the myſtery of God and of the Father, and of Chriſt*; muſt be rendered of God, even the Father, and of Chriſt, appears from your own authority, in your anſwer to The Eſſay on Spirit, and likewiſe in this anſwer *. But without having recourſe to your own authority, the words themſelves, according to the propriety of the Greek language, neceſſarily determine this ſenſe; to the acknowledgment of the myſtery of God even the Father, and of Chriſt: This ſenſe is, beyond any poſſible contradiction, eſtabliſhed by all the parallel paſſages in the New Teſtament, where the ſame expreſſion occurs. See Rom. xv. 6. 1 Cor. xv. 24. 2 Cor. i. 3. 2 Cor. xi. 31. Gal. i. 4. Epheſ. i. 3. Epheſ. v. 20. Philipp. iv. 20. Coloſs. i. 3. Coloſs. iii. 17. 1 Theſs. i. 3. 1 Theſs. iii. 11. 2 Theſs. ii. 16. Jam. i. 27. Jam. iii. 9. 1 Pet. i. 3. Revel. i. 6. (It is proper to remark, that as the article in the Greek, τȣ Θεȣ κ᾽ πατρος, κ᾽ τȣ Χριϛȣ, not being added to

* Theſe are your words: "Where one ſingle article is prefixed to ſeveral nouns, either oppoſitely ranged, or copulatively joined, there one perſon, or thing, is always denoted." See anſwer to Eſſay, p. 62. Again, in this anſwer, you expreſs yourſelf thus: "It is neceſſary, however, to obſerve here, that the term, God, in 1 Cor. xv. 24. is particularly determined by the additional expreſſion, even the Father, (which is exactly parallel to this in Coloſs. ii. 2.) to denote the Perſon of the Father." See p. 41.

Father,

Father, plainly ſhews, that the Father is not a diſtinct Perſon from, but the ſame with, God; ſo the article being added to the word, Chriſt, no leſs plainly ſhews, that Chriſt is a Perſon diſtinct from God, even the Father.) Notwithſtanding the pains you have taken to perplex the ſtate of the queſtion, as propoſed in the Appeal, it ſtill continues fair and clear; the new arguments you have invented for this purpoſe, being found upon examination to be weak and abſurd, and which, I hope, upon a review you will honeſtly retract.

You are obliged to grant, that the unity of God is delivered and inculcated in the cleareſt and ſtrongeſt light, ſo that no poſſible doubt can be made of this grand principle of natural and revealed religion. But then you immediately add, in order to darken this plain truth, "That it is not ſo clearly decided wherein this unity conſiſts, whether in the unity of Agency, or unity of Perſon, and that even my ſtate of the queſtion implies the doubtfulneſs of it."

Anſ. When I conſider the plain declarations of the Bible on one ſide, and the dictates of common ſenſe on the other, I am really ſurprized that any thing ſo extremely clear, ſhould ever have afforded matter for controverſy. It is impoſſible for words to expreſs any thing plainer and ſtronger than the Scriptures declare this important truth, that GOD is ONE; all the ſophiſtry in the world cannot extinguiſh the light of this grand article of all religion: And that this one God is one Perſon, even the Father, as diſtinguiſhed from Chriſt and the Holy Spirit, is no leſs plainly and ſtrongly ſet forth by the ſacred writers. If they had been aſked the queſtion what they meant by one God, they could not have more deciſively anſwered the queſtion,

queſtion, than they have done in their writings, that one God ſurely means one Perſon. Let a Jew, a Mahometan, or Heathen, be aſked what one God ſignifies, they will readily anſwer, one Perſon. Let any unprejudiced and diſintereſted Chriſtian be examined, what is the true meaning of one God, the anſwer will be the ſame. My ſtate of the queſtion did not ariſe from the leaſt doubt I had in my mind, with regard to the genuine ſenſe of the unity of God, but was entirely occaſioned by a love of truth, and an earneſt deſire that the cauſe might be fairly and impartially examined by common Chriſtians, which purpoſe could not have been fully obtained, without a clear view of the ſtate of the caſe on both ſides.

I ſet down ſome deciſive texts relating to the unity of God, without any comment, or paraphraſe, and which, indeed, are impoſſible to be miſunderſtood, without the comments of learned men. You thought yourſelf obliged to ſay ſomething to this collection of texts; and accordingly you fix upon Matth. xix. 16, 17. where our Saviour's anſwer to the young Perſon who called him Good, and deſired to be informed about the right way to eternal life, clearly determines, in oppoſition to the inventions of the learned, that God is not only One, but likewiſe that he is one Perſon; and that Chriſt himſelf diſclaims all pretenſions to a character of ſo high a nature, as that of being equal to God in moral perfections. *Why calleſt thou me good? There is none good but* one, *that is, God.* The words in the Greek neceſſarily ſignify*, There is no Perſon good but one Perſon, which is God; and, conſequently, our Saviour has declared,

* οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς, ὁ Θεός.

if

if words have any determinate meaning, that God is one Perſon, and has decided the queſtion propoſed, in direct oppoſition to the doctrine you are labouring to maintain. When therefore you obſerve, "That Chriſt's affirming none to be good, ſave one, that is, God, does not particularly determine who that one God is, but only ſo far ſhews the abſolute goodneſs of the one God, whatever the nature of his Being may be;" this is obviated by our Lord's own words rightly underſtood, which expreſsly determine, that the one God is one Perſon, whatever the nature of his Being may be, of which nothing is declared.

You go on to obſerve, "That I cannot truly and directly ſay, however I endeavour to inſinuate it, that by aſking the youth, why he called him good, he thereby abſolutely diſclaimed that title; when, according to both Prophets and Apoſtles, he is deſcribed in the higheſt ſenſe, to poſſeſs all moral perfection: It ſhould ſeem therefore, that he declines here, only in order to lead the young man to ſhew, whether his manner of addreſs aroſe from his juſt application of the Prophets to him, as being the divine Perſon of the Meſſiah; or merely from his judging him to be no more than a man, fit however to inſtruct him in his duty, as any other teacher of the law. If from the firſt, it is plain then that our Saviour could not without diſowning himſelf to be that Perſon, refuſe the title in the higheſt ſenſe; and then the direct inference is, that as our Saviour declares God only to be good, ſo now by thus admitting that title to be applied to himſelf alſo, he declares himſelf and God to be one and the ſame Being: And that accordingly, the young man had, ſo far, a right notion of the Deity; which our Saviour's

Saviour's further ſpeech to him *ſeems* to evince." p. 5.

Anſ. As I quoted our Saviour's own words, I had no real occaſion to inſinuate, or directly affirm any thing relating to them, they being abſolutely incapable of any other meaning, than that he diſclaimed the title of good in the higheſt ſenſe. What you have urged to ſhew the contrary, is the produce of imagination only, and depends upon three ſuppoſitions, without the leaſt evidence to ſupport them. 1. You ſuppoſe, that both Prophets and Apoſtles have deſcribed the Meſſiah as a divine Perſon, poſſeſſed of all moral perfections in the higheſt ſenſe; but you produce no declarations of Prophets and Apoſtles that maintain any ſuch doctrine: And therefore, I have the higheſt reaſon to believe, as a conſiſtent Chriſtian, that Chriſt, Prophets and Apoſtles have uniformly taught the ſame fundamental doctrine, namely, That there is One, and but one intelligent Being, or Perſon, poſſeſſed of all poſſible perfection; one ſupreme Lord and Governor, the merciful Father of all rational Beings; the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, to whom no Being can poſſibly be equal in natural, or moral perfections, as a Perſon of the higheſt rank next to God himſelf, has ſolemnly diſclaimed all pretenſions to any ſuch character. 2. Your next ſuppoſition with reſpect to our Saviour's view, in declining the character of good, has no ſort of foundation either in the words of Chriſt, or the context. 3. Your third ſuppoſition, namely, that the young man had any ſuch notion of the Meſſiah, as a Perſon equally divine with the one ſupreme God, is undeniably falſe in fact, it being very evident that the Jews never entertained ſuch an opinion of their Meſſiah,

either in our Saviour's time, or indeed in any other. What you alledge to prove the laſt ſuppoſition is this: Our Saviour's further diſcourſe with him, ſeems to evince that the young man had gained right notions of the Deity, as our Saviour only pointed out the ſecond table of the Decalogue, in anſwer to the young man's queſtion, what he ſhould do to inherit eternal life: But, as you rightly obſerve, the firſt table is as neceſſary to ſecure eternal life as the ſecond, from whence you infer that the young perſon had already acknowledged the firſt table ſo far as to be able to receive a more full explanation of it, if upon further trial he was found worthy to become a diſciple of our Lord. But what follows from hence? Why, you would inſinuate that the young perſon believed God and Chriſt to be one and the ſame Being, of which neither text not context ſay one word, and our Saviour's expreſſion is abſolutely inconſiſtent with any ſuch doctrine. A very good account of this may be given, without the help of vain imaginations. The true reaſon why our Saviour pointed out the ſecond table of the Decalogue, was becauſe the Jews at that time were not ſo apt to be faulty with reſpect to the duty they owed to God as to men. Our Saviour ſeems to take it for granted, that the young perſon had obſerved the firſt table of the Decalogue, when he had ſo frankly profeſſed his obedience to the ſecond.

But after all your far fetched ſuppoſitions, inferences and deductions, you allow that the parallel paſſage in Mark x. *ſeems to diſcountenance your interpretation, becauſe the young man dropt the epithet of good in his reply:* But notwithſtanding this, you maintain that, "The young man ſtill perſiſts in his opinion of Chriſt's capacity, to inſtruct him fully

fully in all that was requiſite to eternal life; and conſequently aſketh him, whether any thing more remained for him to do?"

Anſ. As the epithet good, was dropt in the young man's reply, it may be juſtly inferred, that he took the words of our Saviour as diſclaiming in himſelf that character in the higheſt degree, though doubtleſs he thought him an extraordinary perſon, well qualified to inſtruct him in the way to eternal life; which, ſurely, is very conſiſtent with acknowledging him to be a perſon inferior to the one ſupreme God in all moral perfections.

You go on to obſerve, "that the *other texts produced* to eſtabliſh the unity of God, *might be ſhewn capable of the like interpretation*; but you do not venture to attempt it: Only you think fit to aſk queſtions with regard to theſe expreſs texts for the unity of God." How are theſe texts reconcileable with your doctrine of a ſecondary God in the Perſon of Jeſus Chriſt? Is his ſtrongly affirming that the Lord our God is one Lord, and that there is one God, and none other but he, to be conſtrued into God's authorizing a peculiar and diſtinct worſhip of another God? Doth St. Paul, when he pronounces the ſame God, to be God of the Jews and Gentiles, diſtinguiſh between a firſt and ſecondary God? Nay, rather when he declares that it is one God which ſhall juſtify the circumciſion by faith, and the uncircumciſion through faith, doth he not intimate that both the Jewiſh and Chriſtian diſpenſations, were the works of one and the ſame God, differently characterized, the God of the circumciſion, and the God of the uncircumciſion?" P 6, 7.

Anſ. That God is one Being, or Perſon, is ſo plainly declared in the texts which I have quoted, and

and indeed in every part of Scripture, that it is impoſſible to evade this important truth, without introducing a method of interpretation, that will make the Scripture abſolutely unfit for a rule of faith and practice: And that Chriſt is not this one ſupreme God, but a perſon inferior to him, Chriſt himſelf and his Apoſtles have as plainly declared, as it is poſſible for words to expreſs it. The only difficulty (if any at all) is, how the unity of God is conſiſtent with the high titles and attributes, more eſpecially God, aſcribed to Chriſt in Scripture. Your firſt queſtion has a tendency to aſperſe the New Teſtament itſelf, in which we have an expreſs account of a mediator, to whom the title of God is ſometimes given in the inferior ſenſe: So that, when you aſk, how this is reconcileable with my doctrine, you make me the inventer of it, whereas Chriſt and his Apoſtles have plainly taught the ſame; and, conſequently, you are as much obliged, by virtue of your Chriſtian profeſſion, to endeavour to reconcile it with the unity of God, as I am. In truth, there is no real difficulty in the caſe according to Scripture, which requires us to acknowledge and profeſs one God and Father of all, and one mediator Jeſus Chriſt, to whom the title of a God is ſometimes attributed, whoſe powers, offices, and titles were given him by his God and Father, and to whoſe ultimate glory his greateſt honour redounds. Neither is this, according to your ſecond queſtion, authorizing a diſtinct worſhip of another God. To worſhip another God, if we regard Scripture language, or ſentiment, is to worſhip another ſupreme God, or to aſcribe inferior, or mediatorial worſhip to any perſon, or perſons, without an expreſs warrant from the God of Gods. But this point ſhall

be more particularly conſidered in the courſe of this debate. As to your third queſtion, St. Paul diſtinguiſhes as clearly as poſſible the one ſupreme God, whom he ſtiles the God of Jews and Gentiles, from the one Lord, or Mediator Jeſus Chriſt. As to the title of God, it is not certain that he has aſcribed it to Chriſt at all; or admitting it, it is undoubtedly in the inferior ſenſe. Your next queſtion is a conſequence from the preceding; doubtleſs, St. Paul aſcribes both the Jewiſh and Chriſtian diſpenſations to the one and the ſame God; and it is no leſs plain that he has taken all imaginable care to diſtinguiſh the ſame one God and Father of all, from the one Lord, or mediator Jeſus Chriſt.

The ſubſtance of the next paragraph which is expreſſed in queſtions, is to this effect: "The grace of the Goſpel is of infinitely more conſequence than the priviledges of the Moſaic Law, and conſequently greater praiſe and glory are due for the former, than the latter. Does not this in effect entitle Chriſt to more abundant honour, than the one ſupreme God? Is not this giving the ſupreme a nominal ſuperiority only above the delegated, while this in reality merits the greater praiſe?"

Anſ. That the grace of the Goſpel, is of infinitely more conſequence than the priviledges of the Moſaic Law, no Chriſtian can poſſibly deny. But the Scripture itſelf has expreſsly informed us, *That the Law came by Moſes, but Grace and Truth came by Jeſus Chriſt; and therefore, Chriſt was counted worthy of more Glory than Moſes.* John i. 17. Heb. iii. 3. You muſt ſee from hence that the parallel is drawn between Chriſt and Moſes, the former being the law-giver and mediator of the

the Chriſtians, and the latter of the Jews. The ſame one ſupreme God and Father was the original author of both diſpenſations; and the ſacred writers of the New Teſtament have taken particular care to aſcribe the whole buſineſs of the redemption of Man by Jeſus Chriſt, to the free grace, favour, and mercy of the ſupreme Father of all rational Beings, and have directed Chriſtians both by precept and example, to make their ſolemn acknowledgments to him for all that Chriſt did and ſuffered for us. *God ſo loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that all who believe in him, ſhould not periſh, but have eternal Life. Bleſſed be the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, by the Reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt from the dead.* I refer you to an excellent collection of texts of Scripture relating to this point, and obſervations upon them, in Dr. Sykes's Scripture Doctrine of the Redemption of Man by Jeſus Chriſt. When, therefore, you conſider the Moſaic Law as given by the ſupreme God, and the Chriſtian by an inferior God, according to my ſenſe, you confound a plain caſe clearly and diſtinctly delivered in Scripture; the one ſupreme God being conſtantly repreſented as the original Author of both diſpenſations, who employed Moſes in the one, and Chriſt in the other. The redemption of Man by Chriſt, was a ſcheme formed by the Father of mercies to bring men to ſalvation; and all the merits of Chriſt in accompliſhing this bleſſed work, entirely depend on the free grace, and favour of the one God and Father of all, who appointed and accepted them; and all the acknowledgments we are obliged to make to Chriſt for our redemption, are derived from his

expreſs command, and redound to his ultimate glory.

In order to obviate an objection naturally ariſing to your queſtions, relating to the Moſaic and Chriſtian diſpenſations, you obſerve, "That it is not ſufficient to ſay, that this inferior God is appointed by the ſupreme, unleſs it be expreſsly and clearly ſo declared, and that conſiſtently with God's frequent aſſertions of his unity, excluſive of any other God, and his poſitive declarations that he will not give his glory to another."

Anſ. That Chriſt is a Perſon inferior to the one ſupreme God, and that he received his commiſſion and authority from him to perform the work of redemption, is clearly and expreſsly declared in Scripture; which is very conſiſtent with God's frequent aſſertions of his unity, excluſive of any other God; any other God, according to Scripture, plainly ſignifies a Being ſet up as ſupreme in oppoſition to the one true God, but has no relation to Chriſt, who has the title of God given him in the inferior ſenſe, upon the account of authority and dominion derived from the one ſupreme God. It is impoſſible in the nature of things, that the one ſupreme ſhould give his glory to another, that glory I mean, whereby he is acknowledged as a Being poſſeſſed of all poſſible perfection, and from whom all other perſons, or beings, derive their exiſtence. But how does it follow from this declaration, that Almighty God is precluded from a right to appoint a mediator to be honoured as ſuch, which we find to be the plain doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles? But this ſhall be farther cleared up in its proper place. When God in Iſaiah xlii. 8. is repreſented as declaring, *I will not give my Glory to another*, it is immediately

ly added, *neither my Praiſe to graven Images:* Chriſtian writers ſhould be cautious how they put the bleſſed Jeſus and the idols of the heathens upon the ſame footing, unleſs we believe in oppoſition to his own words, that he is equal to, or one God with, the Father.

The deſign of your two next paragraphs is, to point out the hazard that Chriſtians are expoſed to of worſhipping Chriſt the ſecondary God with the higheſt honour, as being the perſon upon the account of whoſe interpoſition, God hath done more for the world than ever he did before, or than he was obliged to by his truth and juſtice. As mankind are naturally apt to run into ſuch an error, it is not improbable even from this conſideration, that the Father and Son, are one God.

Anſ. When you conſider the redemption as effected by the interpoſition of Chriſt; or as if God ſhowed himſelf placable to a ſinful world, merely upon account of Chriſt, you miſrepreſent the caſe, and really, though undeſignedly, break in upon the moral attributes of God, who is a Being not only of juſtice and holineſs, but likewiſe of love, mercy, and goodneſs. We do an injury to his character, when we look upon him as ſtrictly and rigidly juſt, requiring the utmoſt ſatisfaction for the offences of his creatures, without the exerciſe of mercy. But reaſon and revelation jointly conſpire to repreſent the almighty Creator as a Being, in whom all moral perfections are united: And particularly, nothing is more plainly revealed, nothing more powerfully inſiſted upon through every part of the New Teſtament, than that the one God and Father contrived the whole ſcheme of redemption, and by his ſupreme authority ſent the Son to accompliſh this bleſſed work; and that

the whole flowed from the pure grace and favour of the merciful Father of all rational Beings. There is nothing ſaid of God's infinite wrath requiring infinite ſatisfaction; there is nothing ſaid of Chriſt's reconciling God to us, but the Scripture always repreſents God as reconciling the world to himſelf, or Chriſt reconciling them to God: This remarkable difference of expreſſion, neceſſarily points out the original mercy and compaſſion of the great Creator; that he wanted not the interpoſition of any Being to render him placable to a ſinful world, and to receive penitents into favour. All that Chriſt did and ſuffered for us, was the effect of God's love and kindneſs, but by no means ſhould be conſidered as the cauſe, which expreſsly contradicts God's moral character, and the plain declarations of his holy word.

As to the hazard of men's being tempted to pay the higheſt reverence to the inſtrument of their redemption, this is no more than men are liable to in the ordinary courſe of God's providence. It is an argument of ſuch a nature as proves too much, and implies a reflection on God's moral government; that he ſhould never employ any inferior inſtrument for the benefit of his creatures, leſt they ſhould be tempted to worſhip the inſtrument in preference to, or in conjunction with, the almighty Creator. Have not men been tempted to worſhip the ſun, moon, and ſtars, and likewiſe their dead benefactors, as ſo many Gods? Almighty God hath ſo plainly revealed himſelf by the works of creation and providence, that I profeſs myſelf aſtoniſhed at the wilful blindneſs of ſo many rational creatures, who have not ſeen him and have not adored him; which is ſufficient to vindicate God's moral government, who has done all

that

that is conſiſtent with the character of a righteous Governor of the Univerſe, to give mankind a juſt notion of his Being, and his will, and has likewiſe enabled them to practiſe what they may know to be their duty. So likewiſe with regard to revelation, the ſame Almighty Being is ſtill more plainly ſet forth, to be one ſupreme Intelligent Agent, or Perſon, of all poſſible perfection, the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who has taken all imaginable care to maintain and ſecure the ſupreme honour and glory of his God and Father; ſo that I am really amazed at that fatal apoſtacy of ſo many Chriſtian Churches, which have dared to ſet up two Perſons, as equal objects of faith and worſhip with the one ſupreme God and Father of all. As men in all ages and countries, have been too apt to corrupt the principles of reaſon; ſo Jews and Chriſtians, who have been favoured with an extraordinary revelation, have been liable to corrupt it with inventions of their own: ſo that the hazard you ſpeak of Chriſtians making Chriſt the principal object of religious worſhip, becauſe he was employed in the glorious work of redemption, though all imaginable care has been taken to prevent it, is no more than men are uſually obnoxious to, in the ordinary diſpenſations of providence: which demonſtrates the abſolute neceſſity of bringing all human decrees, though eſtabliſhed by the greateſt authority upon earth, to the teſt of Scripture interpreted by reaſon.

In your next paragraph you obſerve, that "from an attentive view of the whole great work of our redemption, it muſt manifeſtly appear, that the perſon immediately concerned in bringing it about, hath originally more power, and a nearer connexion with the Deity, than you are willing to

grant; and, conſequently, muſt have *received* theſe extraordinary favours in lieu of as extraordinary privileges, temporarily renounced by him, no leſs than a compartition of power and glory: for I believe, you will not deny that he was to reſume his former dignity and glory, which he had with the Father, after he had finiſhed his work here." P. 8, 9.

Anſ. I am very willing to allow our bleſſed Saviour every title, attribute, and all religious honour, expreſsly aſcribed to him in Scripture, and am determined in my ſentiments upon this important point, by a ſtrict regard to the word of God, without indulging vain imaginations of my own. By comparing the whole of what is delivered concerning Chriſt, I believe him to have a nearer connexion with the Deity, than any other Perſon revealed in Scripture. But that he had originally an equal ſhare of power and glory with the Father, is abſolutely impoſſible, and expreſsly contradicted in numberleſs paſſages of Scripture. I have often obſerved of learned men, that at the very time they are labouring to maintain the Athanaſian doctrine, they can ſcarce write a page without ſelf-contradiction, which is your caſe in this paragraph; for I cannot help judging by the principles of common ſenſe, that a perſon who receives extraordinary favours, which is your aſſertion, from God, cannot poſſibly be equal to him, from whom he received them. There is an eternal difference between giving and receiving, as all unprejudiced perſons muſt neceſſarily allow. Whatever was the original glory which Chriſt had with the Father, of which we have no clear account in ſcripture, neither is the knowledge of it neceſſary, we are plainly informed in the New Teſtament, that

he

he was raiſed to higher dignity and glory than he had before, upon account of his amazing humiliation and ſufferings, and that the whole was owing to the free grace and favour of the one ſupreme God and Father of all.

I come now to conſider your objections to that part of Scripture, which I have produced with remarks upon it.

You have fairly repreſented my ſenſe of the firſt part of that ſolemn prayer addreſſed to God by our bleſſed Saviour, John xvii. Only you inſinuate, that *I have ſingled out one particular part*, as if I had omitted ſomething that would have given my Chriſtian readers other ſentiments. Now my buſineſs was to ſhew from Scripture, who the one God is; for which purpoſe I began with this prayer of our bleſſed Saviour, and quoted what was neceſſary to point out who was the object of this prayer, and what is his real character, neither is any thing left out proper to aſcertain this important point.

You obſerve as to my firſt aſſertion, namely, that the Father is here declared to be the only true God, as contradiſtinguiſhed from Jeſus Chriſt; "then, according to your principles, Chriſt is not only falſely called God, and the true God by the Scriptures themſelves; but your interpretation plainly contradicts your own principles; according to which you allow Chriſt to be an inferior conſtituted God, and as ſuch, conſequently, as true a God by virtue of the Father's appointment, as the Father is the only true ſupreme God by virtue of his own nature: to which diſtinction of ſupreme and inferior, you are obliged to have recourſe, in order to palliate the abſurdity of aſſerting the Father to be the only true God, at the

ſame

ſame time that you admit the Son to be another true inferior God." Page 9.

Anſ. It is a particular ſatisfaction to my mind, that you can ſcarce proceed one ſtep in your Anſwer to my Appeal, without fixing a reproach upon the Scripture itſelf. Has not our Saviour ſtiled the Father the only true God? This you dare not deny. And is it not equally plain to an unprejudiced reader, that the Father is ſo ſtiled, in diſtinction from Jeſus Chriſt? But you infer from this, which is the ſolemn declaration of Chriſt himſelf, that then Chriſt is falſely called God in Scripture. Surely, this is reproaching Scripture itſelf, for giving the title of God to any other Perſon, beſides the one ſupreme God. When the Father in this, and ſeveral other texts, is expreſsly ſtiled the only true God, and at the ſame time it is a plain matter of fact, that other perſons, particularly Chriſt, have the title of God given them; this is declaring in other terms, that the Father is the only ſupreme God. Neither does it follow from hence, that other Beings are falſely called Gods: Moſes is juſtly ſtiled a God, becauſe he received an extraordinary commiſſion from the one ſupreme God; Angels are juſtly ſtiled Gods in the Old Teſtament, upon account of their authority derived from God; and our Saviour is juſtly ſtiled a God upon a ſtill higher account, which is very conſiſtent with the Father, being the one ſupreme God, from whom Chriſt has received his being, titles, and attributes. Thus the one ſupreme is ſtiled the God of Gods: ſo that your anſwer to my aſſertion is directly levelled againſt Scripture; and to charge me with abſurdity, is to fix the ſame charge upon our Lord himſelf, who has expreſsly contended for the notion of an inferior God,

though

though he has ſolemnly declared the Father to be the only true God. In truth, there is no abſurdity in it, and is very agreeable to the uſual ſtyle of Scripture in other inſtances. See An Appeal to the Common, &c. p. 40. 2d edit.

You add to this, "The Son upon your principles muſt be a true God; for God, you ſay, or rather by induction ſtrongly intimate, can truly communicate his own proper attributes to a creature, upon which you build your ſuppoſition of an inferior God: the communication then, muſt truly and effectually make that creature a God; the proper attributes of the Deity, being no leſs than the very nature of God himſelf." Page 9, 10.

Anſ. I built my notion of an inferior God, upon the expreſs authority of Scripture, no leſs than that of our Lord and Maſter Jeſus Chriſt. See Appeal, p. 36, 37. 2d edit. That the one ſupreme God can communicate very extraordinary powers, and attributes to his creatures, and can inveſt any particular Being with dominion over any part of the Creation, he thinks agreeable to his wiſdom, ſo that he may be juſtly ſtiled a God with reſpect to the creatures whom he governs, is very evident from the principles of reaſon, and is likewiſe the doctrine of revelation. But I never maintained, that God can communicate *his very nature* to any Being whatſoever, that being an expreſs contradiction. The true idea of God is that of a Being poſſeſſed of all poſſible perfection, and particularly ſelf-exiſtence, and independence: to imagine that God can *make* another equally *ſelf-exiſtent* and *independent* God, is a contradiction in terms, and in nature it is abſolutely impoſſible, that two ſelf-exiſtent Gods ſhould exiſt at all.

With

With regard to my ſecond aſſertion, relating to our Saviour's words, namely, that he profeſſes to ſet forth, in the moſt ample manner, the true notion of Almighty God; you obſerve, that "by giving us alſo a true notion of himſelf, which according to you, he as fully doth, as of Almighty God; in the words, *Jeſus Chriſt, whom thou haſt ſent*, he either exhibits more than he intended in the deſcription, or the words muſt belong to the true notion of Almighty God.——If the former be the caſe, his deſcription is not ſo clear and diſtinct, nor ſo ſtrong and powerful, as you would have it to be; ſince it is plain that by his adding the knowledge of Chriſt, to the means neceſſary to eternal life, he makes the knowledge of God not only mixed and confuſed; but at the ſame time renders the only true God as inſufficient of himſelf to procure the deſired end.——But if theſe words belong to the true notion of Almighty God; and the paſſage is a profeſſed deſcription of him, you then ſay, that our Saviour is guilty of an abſolute falſhood, as there are two Perſons of the Godhead left out in the deſcription. But from your own principles it is plain, that the Father is not the only true God, but rather the only true ſupreme God: it cannot then be inferred by you from this paſſage, that Chriſt is denied to be God, and conſequently left out in the deſcription: if therefore the paſſage doth not exclude Chriſt, who is named, it can never exclude the Holy Ghoſt, who is not named nor implied." Page 10, 11.

Anſ. I am really diſpoſed to pity the great pains you have taken, to perplex and darken a plain declaration of our bleſſed Saviour, in order to ſupport a favourite opinion eſtabliſhed by human authority. Our Lord's evident deſign is to give us

a true

a true notion of the one ſupreme God, and likewiſe of the Perſon whom he hath employed in the work of men's ſalvation; by adding, *Jeſus Chriſt, whom thou haſt ſent*, he does not exhibit more than he intended, neither does the addition render his deſcription of God leſs clear and diſtinct. Here are two Perſons deſcribed in their proper and reſpective characters, the Father and Chriſt; our Saviour declares the former to be the only true God, as plainly as words can expreſs it, and the latter to be the Perſon, whom the Father, the only true God, hath ſent. A plain ſenſible Chriſtian cannot poſſibly, without the help of learned ſophiſtry, take the words in any other ſenſe, than that the Father is the only true God, as diſtinguiſhed from Chriſt, an extraordinary Perſon ſent from the only God upon the important buſineſs of eternal life. But ſome learned men inform us in defiance to noon-day light, that Chriſt is included in the deſcription of the only true God, from whom he is expreſsly contradiſtinguiſhed, and is likewiſe deſcribed by a peculiar character. This declaration does not indeed deny Chriſt to be a God in the inferior ſenſe, which title is ſometimes given him: but it certainly excludes Chriſt from being what is ſo plainly, clearly, and diſtinctly appropriated to the Father. To imagine that Chriſt is included in this deſcription of the only true God, is infinitely abſurd, and it is ſtill more abſurd, if poſſible, to entertain the ſame notion of the Holy Ghoſt, who is neither named, nor implied, and who is never ſtiled God, or Lord, in the ſacred writings.

As to what you obſerve farther upon this article, relating to the union of the Father and Chriſt, ſet forth in this chapter, I ſhall conſider it in its proper place.

Upon my laſt aſſertion, namely, that *the extraordinary favour of eternal Life, chiefly depends on the right knowledge of God*; you argue thus: "If this be ſo, and yet our Saviour declares this knowledge to conſiſt in that of the Son, as well as of the Father; the notion of the Son muſt then alſo be included in the notion of Almighty God.——You maintain that there is the ſame efficacy applied to the knowledge of the Son as of the Father, and conſequently, eternal life depends as much upon the one as the other, which could not poſſibly be the caſe, if the Son be a perſon inferior to Almighty God." Page 11, 12.

Anſ. When Almighty God thinks fit to employ an inſtrument for the accompliſhment of any deſign, doubtleſs the perſons, upon whoſe account this is done, ought to acknowledge the immediate inſtrument, as well as principal. Our Saviour was the Perſon ſent by God, to reveal eternal life to the ſons of men; and conſequently, it was highly reaſonable, and even neceſſary, that men ſhould be required to believe in, and acknowledge Chriſt, as well as the ſupreme Father, who employed him upon this important commiſſion. But to argue from hence, that the Son is included in the notion of Almighty God, from whom he is expreſsly diſtinguiſhed by a peculiar inferior character, and by whom he is at the ſame time ſaid to be ſent, is ſuch a groſs inſult upon common ſenſe, and all language, that one would think it impoſſible for learned men, one after another, to perſiſt in this abſurdity, if it was not too evident to be denied. The argument you inſiſt upon to prove our Saviour, included in the notion of Almighty God, will equally prove that Moſes, whom God employed in the immediate delivery of the Jewiſh Law, was included

in

in the notion of the one ſupreme God, becauſe the people were required to believe in him as well as God. *The people feared the Lord, and believed the Lord, and his ſervant Moſes.* Exod. xiv. 31. Be pleaſed to review your own expreſſions in this parallel caſe: "*The Belief in Moſes* is jointly, and equally made, a neceſſary means of *obtaining the divine favour*, with *the Belief in the Lord*; which, therefore, ſhould induce all reaſonable men, to interpret the words in ſuch a manner, as not to make the *Belief* in a Creature, appear to be of equal conſequence with the *Belief* in his Creator; and therefore, *Moſes* muſt be included in the notion of the *Lord*." I hope you will ſeriouſly re-examine what you have advanced upon this important point, which is your duty as a ſincere Chriſtian, and honeſtly retract what undeniably appears to be incapable of a rational defence; it being very evident, that a cauſe, which requires ſuch ſupports, is falſe at bottom.

1 Cor. viii. 5, 6. With regard to this plain and expreſs determination of St. Paul, it is impoſſible it ſhould be miſunderſtood by any unprejudiced reader, without the help of learned ſophiſtry. If St. Paul had been aſked the queſtion, Who is the God of the Chriſtians? he could not have anſwered it more clearly and deciſively, than in theſe very words, *To us*, namely Chriſtians, *there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by (or through) whom are all things*; that is, all things relating to the ſalvation of Man. If the Perſon of the Father, be not the one ſupreme God, but the Son and Holy Ghoſt are equally included in this deſcription, though the former is expreſsly diſtinguiſhed from the one God, by a peculiar character, and the latter is not men-

tioned at all; I muſt freely own, that St. Paul is no Apoſtle to me; for in this caſe I cannot depend upon him, when he delivers the cleareſt ſentiment, in the plaineſt language. But I muſt attend you, whilſt you labour to confound the diſtinct meaning of this unanſwerable declaration.

You obſerve, that "I miſtake the intention of St. Paul, which is plainly to ſhew that there is but one God, and one Lord, in oppoſition to the many Heathen Gods and Lords; at the ſame time obviating the ſlander of the Heathens, who retorted Polytheiſm on the Chriſtians, on account of their worſhipping beſides God, the man Chriſt Jeſus; as well as the malice of the Jews, who to depreciate the crucified Jeſus, diſtinguiſhed between a ſuffering and triumphant Meſſiah." Page 12, 13.

Anſ. That I did not miſtake the intention of St. Paul, appears from your own account; for if it was his profeſſed deſign to ſhew, that there is but one God and one Lord, in oppoſition to the many Heathen Gods and Lords, it is certainly very natural to infer from hence, that St. Paul would ſet forth to Chriſtians, who was their God, and who was their Lord. Accordingly, he has done it in a very ſolemn manner: 'Though there be, ſays he, in the opinion of the Heathens, Gods many, that is, many celeſtial ſovereign Gods in Heaven; and Lords many, that is, many Baalim, or Lords, agents and preſidents over earthly things; yet to us Chriſtians there is but one ſovereign God, the Father, of whom are all things, and to whom, as ſupreme, we are to direct all our ſervices; and but one Lord-agent Jeſus Chriſt, by whom are all things, that come from the Father to us, and through whom alone we find acceſs unto him.' [See Mr. Locke on the place, with a quotation from Mede.]

Mede.] This determination of St. Paul, is not only clear and deciſive, but likewiſe extremely juſt and elegant: as the Heathens had many ſupreme Deities, and many inferior Lords; ſo Chriſtians have but one ſupreme, who is the Father, and one inferior Lord, or mediator, Jeſus Chriſt.

As to your obſervation, that St. Paul meant to obviate the ſlander of the Heathens, who retorted Polytheiſm on the Chriſtians, it does not appear to be founded in fact. St. Paul was charged by the Heathens as a ſetter forth of ſtrange Gods, becauſe he preached to them Jeſus and the Reſurrection, which they thought were two diſtinct Gods. But if you carefully attend to his diſcourſe to the Athenians, recorded in the ſame chapter, he took care to ſet them right, by inculcating the belief of one ſupreme God, the Maker of Heaven and Earth; and I do not find that Chriſtianity was at firſt charged with Polytheiſm.

As to your other obſervation relating to the Jews, that St. Paul by one Mediator, meant to guard againſt the malice of the Jews, who, to depreciate the crucified Jeſus, diſtinguiſhed between a ſuffering and triumphant Meſſiah; it is very probable, that ſuch a notion did not obtain in the Apoſtle's days; it was invented after their time, when the Jews found themſelves diſtreſſed by the argument drawn from prophecies of the Old Teſtament. Beſide the Apoſtle is ſpeaking profeſſedly of Heathen idolatry, and not of Jewiſh errors: as the Heathens had many Lords, or an order of inferior Gods, ſo Chriſtians own but one Lord Jeſus Chriſt.

Your next obſervation is, that " as the title of Lord is appropriated to the Son; and yet the Scriptures do elſewhere plainly declare the Father, as

well as the Son, to be Lord; and conſequently, two Lords, contrary to this of St. Paul. Again, if the word Lord, in the New Teſtament, deſigns only the Son, the higheſt divine attributes are thereby given to the Son. The Lord, whereby, according to you, the Son is eſpecially diſtinguiſhed, is frequently deſcribed to be, and to do, what God Almighty is always underſtood to be, and to perform. Where the expreſſion therefore, Lord God, is uſed without any particular ſpecification, it ſhould ſeem more reaſonable to determine it, to denote the Son than the Father. Since by your doctrine, Lord, is the peculiar appellation of the Son, and you do not deny, that he is alſo called God, though in an inferior ſenſe. But beyond all doubt, the Lord our God is expreſsly declared in St. Mark xii. 29. to be one Lord; and verſe 32, it is aſſerted alſo, that there is none other but he: and it is as certainly ſaid by St. Paul, *To us there is but one God the Father—and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt:* It therefore plainly follows, that as by the words of the Evangeliſt, there is but one God and one Lord, and that the one God is that one Lord; ſo Jeſus Chriſt, who is equally affirmed by the Apoſtle to be the one Lord, muſt alſo be the one God." Page 13, 14.

Anſ. As to your charging me with owning two Lords, I anſwer in the expreſs words of Scripture. *The Lord*, namely JEHOVAH, *ſaid to my Lord*, namely, ADON, an inferior Lord, *Sit thou on my right-hand, till I make thine enemies thy foot-ſtool.* Pſalm cx. i. cited by Chriſt himſelf, Mark xii. 36. But the queſtion is, how this is conſiſtent with the ſolemn determination of our Saviour in the ſame chapter v. 29. that *the Lord our God is one Lord.* Why, really there is no other difficulty

in

in the caſe but what is introduced by learned ſophiſtry: the ſcripture, interpreted by common ſenſe, is plain and clear. The Father is the one ſupreme Lord and Governor, the Lord of Heaven and Earth, expreſsly diſtinguiſhed from Chriſt, and all other Beings; no other Perſon can poſſibly be Lord in this ſupreme and eminent ſenſe; and Chriſt is ſtiled the only Lord mediator, in a ſenſe peculiar to his character, and in which no other Being can be Lord. Common ſenſe can eaſily convince unprejudiced Chriſtians, that a Perſon who is *made Lord* by Almighty God, cannot poſſibly be the ſame Being with, or equal to, *the ſupreme Lord and God*, by whom he was made what he was. The word Lord, in St. Paul's epiſtles, generally ſignifies Chriſt, who is always ſufficiently diſtinguiſhed from the ſupreme Lord of Heaven and Earth; neither is he ſtiled in any one paſſage Lord God, which is the peculiar character of the Father. The higheſt divine attributes are never given to the Son. God Almighty may properly be ſaid to perform, what he does by an inferior inſtrument.

When you argue that the one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, muſt be the one God, becauſe it is ſaid, that *the Lord our God is one Lord*, you introduce darkneſs and confuſion into a caſe, plainly delivered in Scripture. There is no ſort of inconſiſtency, when the Scripture declares that there is one ſupreme Lord and Governor, and that there is one Lord, or mediator Jeſus Chriſt: as it would be infinitely abſurd to imagine, that the one ſupreme Lord, ſhould be included in the notion of the one Lord Jeſus Chriſt; ſo it is equally ſo, that the one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, ſhould be included in the notion of the one God and Lord of all, even the Father, from whom

he is d ſtinguiſhed, in the moſt ſolemn manner, by a peculiar character.

You produce the Prophet Zechariah, ch. xiv. v. 5, 9. to ſhew, that Chriſt is ſtiled *the Lord my God*, and *one Lord*. p. 14. *Anſ.* You aſſert this in expreſs contradiction to the whole purport of the chapter, and indeed every part of the Prophet. The title of Lord, or Jehovah, is undeniably applied to the one ſupreme God, in every paſſage where it occurs. See verſes 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21. and remarkable it is, that in the foregoing chapter, the *Lord of Hoſts*, namely Jehovah, is expreſsly diſtinguiſhed from the Shepherd, who is Chriſt, v. 7. Again, v. 9. the ſame perſon, who v. 7. is diſtinguiſhed from the Shepherd, is ſtiled the *Lord my God:* the whole verſe, part of which you have quoted, is a glorious prophecy of that bleſſed time, which all ſincere Chriſtians ought to pray for, *When the Lord ſhall be King over all the earth: in that day ſhall there be one Lord, and his name one.* v. 9. That is, all the inhabitants of the earth ſhall acknowledge one ſupreme God, and all Heathen and Chriſtian idolatry, and falſe worſhip, ſhall be demoliſhed.

Epheſ. iv. 4, 5, 6. I obſerved upon theſe words, that they are ſo diſtinct and clear, that it is impoſſible to miſunderſtand them, without the comments of learned men. I ſhall ſet down the whole of what you have advanced, upon this important declaration of St. Paul.

"But the clear and diſtinct mention, and not deſcription, as you call it, of the one God, one Lord, and one Spirit. Epheſ. iv. 4, 5, 6. doth, indeed, evidence three Perſons, but by no means diſproves theſe three Perſons to be one God. For the Apoſtle exhorting the Epheſians to keep the

unity

unity of the Spirit in the bond of Peace, aſſigns, as a motive for their ſo doing, their being called to be members of the one body, the Chriſtian church, enlightened and conducted by the one Spirit, and having moreover, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm, one God and Father of all.——Now the diſtinct mention of each Perſon, and particular mark of unity added to each; as they are inſiſted on here, to enforce union and concord in the church of Epheſus, ſo lately converted from Paganiſm; ſo were they further intended to point out an abſolute diſunion in the Perſons, they would ſeem rather to fruſtrate the ſcope of the Apoſtle's exhortation, by giving the Epheſians to underſtand, that inſtead of one God, they had one ſupreme, and two inferior creature Gods; inſtead of one Lord, they had one Supreme, and two inferior Lords; and inſtead of one Spirit, they had one ſupreme Spirit (for God is a Spirit), and two inferior, one animating an human Body, the other, indeed, a pure unbodied Spirit.—This interpretation ſeems but aukwardly to anſwer the Apoſtle's deſign: would it not be more conſiſtent to ſuppoſe, that he choſe upon this occaſion, to mention the three Perſons by terms common to them all; yet by a peculiar application, each becoming for certain reaſons, the diſtinguiſhing character of ſome one, or other, of the Perſons? This exactly correſponding with the general tenour of the Scriptures, and the particular doctrine of the Apoſtle in other paſſages, preſerves at once the diſtinction and unity of the Perſons; ſtrongly intimating them to be the one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all; this three-fold diſtinguiſhing addition, referring to the diſtinct character and office

of each Perſon, in this oeconomy of man's redemption." Page 14, 15.

Anſ. I agree with you, that the Apoſtle in exhorting the Epheſians to love and concord, aſſigns as a motive for this lovely practice, their being members of the ſame body the Church; and that they profeſs the ſame faith, namely, the ſame Spirit, the ſame Lord, and the ſame God and Father of all. But we differ very widely, when you obſerve that this argument drawn from the ſame profeſſion of faith would have no weight, but would rather fruſtrate the ſcope of the Apoſtle's exhortation, unleſs the three Perſons were equally ſupreme, and all together were the one God and Father of all. It is great pity that this eminent Apoſtle did not underſtand the nature of the argument he was urging, nor the moſt proper way of expreſſing his ſentiments: for upon ſuppoſition that words have any determinate ſenſe, he has delivered a doctrine directly contrary to what you contend for. The one God and Father of all is as clearly diſtinguiſhed from the one Lord and one Spirit, as it is poſſible for any language to expreſs it; and the diſtinction is ſtill more remarkable by other things being inſerted between, *one Faith* and *one Baptiſm*, to which obſervation you make no anſwer: and when the Apoſtle adds that the one God is above *all*, the Son and Holy Spirit, muſt certainly be included in *all*, becauſe they are conſtantly repreſented in the New Teſtament, as inferior to the one God, and acting in all things according to his ſupreme will and pleaſure. Surely, the Epheſian Chriſtians might with the greateſt propriety, be ſaid to have the ſame faith, when they profeſſed their belief in the ſame one ſupreme God, in the ſame Lord, or Mediator, and in the ſame Holy

Holy Spirit, whom God employed in the glorious work of redemption and ſanctification; and, conſequently, the Son and Spirit were united with the Father in a very excellent ſenſe, by promoting the ſame glorious end. There is no other diſunion in the Perſons, but what neceſſarily ariſes from their diſtinct natures, ſo ſtrongly pointed out in theſe remarkable words; and therefore, my interpretation fully anſwers the Apoſtle's deſign.

As to what you ſuppoſe a more conſiſtent interpretation, which you have expreſſed obſcurely, the true meaning of it, when reduced to plain Engliſh, is evidently this: the *one Spirit* ſignifies Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, but more particularly, the Spirit; the *one Lord* denotes Father, Son, and Spirit, but more particularly, the Son; and the *one God and Father of all*, ſignifies Father, Son, and Spirit, but more eſpecially, the Father. I cannot help obſerving upon this, that there is no abſurdity ſo great, no error ſo monſtrous, but what might be eaſily deduced from Scripture, if ſuch a liberty was taken in the interpretation of it, as you have indulged in this plain, diſtinct, and ſolemn declaration of St. Paul. To repeat ſuch a groſs and infinitely abſurd expoſition, is abundantly ſufficient to anſwer it to all unprejudiced and diſintereſted perſons, who dare exerciſe their common ſenſe upon religious ſubjects. If the Apoſtle had entertained the ſame ſentiments with you, upon this important ſubject, he would have ſaid, one Spirit, one Lord, one Father, which three Perſons are one God. But, that *one* Spirit ſhould ſignify *three* Spirits, *one* Lord *three* Lords, *one* God *three* Gods, is ſuch a perverſion of all language and ſentiment, as undeniably demonſtrates the falſhood of the cauſe you are labouring to ſup-

port, it being an evident caſe that men of ſenſe and learning, would not have recourſe to ſuch abſurd interpretations, if their cauſe admitted of a plain and rational ſenſe. As you profeſs yourſelf a ſincere Chriſtian, it is certainly your duty to conſider, in what manner you treat the word of God, which has no other tendency but to expoſe it to the ſcoffs of unbelievers.

1 Cor. xii. 4, 5, 6. I remarked upon theſe texts, that agreeably to what was laſt quoted from the epiſtle to the Epheſians, the ſame God undeniably means the one God and Father of all, as diſtinguiſhed from the ſame Lord, namely, Jeſus Chriſt, and from the ſame Spirit. Your anſwer is to this effect: "Theſe words, taken by themſelves, do ſeem to anſwer what you contend for; but the whole chapter, conſidered together, ſtrongly proves the quite contrary. For as you ſeem to think, that the different offices, here ſpecified, do deſign the different characters of each Perſon; ſo are they then peculiar to each; and, conſequently, not to be indiſcriminately attributed to any one of them. But, why then doth St. Paul, in enumerating, immediately after, the gifts of the Spirit, not only reckon amongſt them, as well the diverſities of adminiſtrations, as of operations; but alſo poſitively declare, that it is the one and ſelf-ſame Spirit that worketh all theſe: which expreſſion he before, as you would perſuade us, had eminently attributed to the God and Father of all? For certainly, as the word of wiſdom, the word of knowledge, and faith, are the gifts of the Spirit; ſo the office of preaching in conſequence of the imparted word of wiſdom; the office of interpreting in conſequence of the imparted word of knowledge; and the office of healing diſeaſes and adminiſtering to

the

the infirmities of the ſick, in conſequence of the imparted faith, are evident parts of thoſe diverſities of miniſtries, by you appropriated to the appointment of the Lord. And that all theſe are, notwithſtanding, no leſs to be enumerated amongſt the operations of Almighty God, is plain from the 28th verſe of this chapter; where God is expreſsly ſaid to have ſet ſome in the Church, firſt Apoſtles, &c. diſtinctly anſwering to the ſeveral gifts, adminiſtrations, and powers before aſcribed to the expreſs operation of the Holy Spirit, and which in the fore-cited chapter to the Epheſians, v. 11. are as ſtrongly, and as expreſsly, attributed to Chriſt. It is plain therefore, that in theſe inſtances, the term, God, doth not ſolely mean the Father, but alſo extends to the other two Perſons."

This and the two following chapters, were probably occaſioned by ſome enquiries of the Corinthians, relating to ſpiritual Perſons and their different gifts, concerning which there ſeems to have been ſome ſtrife and diſorder amongſt them. In the ſecond verſe of this chapter, he obſerves, that the Gentile converts had been very lately groſs idolaters, and therefore they ſhould not value themſelves too highly upon the account of their ſpiritual gifts, which they had received in conſequence of embracing Chriſtianity. Ver. 3. He obſerves with reſpect to the Jews, that no perſon who oppoſes Chriſt, and his religion, can make the leaſt claim to the Spirit of God: on the other hand, whoſoever, whether Jew or Gentile, acknowledges Jeſus as Lord, or Meſſias, muſt do it by the Spirit of God; that is, he hath no other ground for his belief, but a revelation from the Spirit of God: the proper uſe to be made of this was, that neither Heathen, nor Jewiſh converts, ſhould lay any

claim

claim to ſuperiority, or deſpiſe any of their brethren upon account of poſſeſſing the Spirit of God, which other believers were entitled to, as well as themſelves. It is obſervable, that the Apoſtle in the 3d verſe, undeniably diſtinguiſhes God from the Spirit, and the Lord Jeſus. God, Spirit, Lord, cannot poſſibly admit of any other interpretation, than that God denotes the Father, as diſtinguiſhed from the Son and Holy Spirit.

Then the Apoſtle goes on to urge another conſideration, proper to engage the Corinthians to lay aſide all contention, upon account of ſome ſpiritual endowments being more valuable than others: namely, that all ſpiritual gifts were derived from the *ſame Spirit*; that all the different officers of the Church acted under the *ſame Lord*; and that all theſe extraordinary powers, were the effect of the immediate operation of the *ſame God*. Ver. 4. to v. 12.

Then the Apoſtle illuſtrates the point he had in view, by a very apt ſimilitude taken from the human body, wherein all the members are uſeful in their way, though ſome are deſigned for a more honourable uſe than others: as the different members of the body mutually promote each others good; ſo perſons in the Church poſſeſſing different gifts, ſhould exerciſe them for mutual edification, without ſtrife or diviſion. Ver. 12, to the end of the chapter.

What therefore can be determined, from the whole deſign of the chapter to prove, that the ſame Spirit, the ſame Lord, and the ſame God, do not ſignify the ſame Perſons expreſſed in the 3d verſe, and diſtinctly ſet forth by St. Paul, in the fore-cited chapter to the Epheſians? why, you argue that the ſame God in the 6th verſe, and God

in

in the 28th verſe, do not ſolely mean the Father, but alſo the Son and Holy Ghoſt; becauſe the Apoſtle in reciting the gifts of the Spirit, reckons the word of wiſdom, the word of knowledge and faith, which are evident parts of miniſteries appropriated to the appointment of the Lord. And that all theſe are to be reckoned amongſt the operations of Almighty God, is plain from the 28th verſe of this chapter; and which in the fore-cited chapter to the Epheſians, ver. 11. are as ſtrongly attributed to Chriſt. How weak and fallacious this argument is, appears from the whole ſcheme of the Goſpel diſpenſation: it is uniformly declared by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, that Chriſt, in conſideration of his amazing humiliation and ſufferings, *received* power from the Father to *ſend* the Holy Ghoſt upon the Apoſtles, and firſt converts to Chriſtianity. Acts ii. 33. *Being*, (namely, Jeſus) *by the right hand of God* exalted, *and having* received *of the Father the promiſe of the Holy Ghoſt, he hath ſhed forth this, which ye now ſee and hear.* In purſuance of this diſpenſation, the Apoſtle attributes the various gifts, with which the Corinthians were endued, to the Holy Spirit. In the government of the church, God hath *made* Jeſus Lord, and the Holy Spirit as chief miniſter, through whom the different officers acting under Chriſt, are enabled to exerciſe their gifts. It is, therefore, with the greateſt propriety, declared by the Apoſtle, that the ſame God worketh all in all, as he is the original and ſupreme author of every gift and bleſſing derived to Chriſtians, through Chriſt and the Holy Spirit, it being agreeable to the uſual method of God's governing the moral world, to act by ſubordinate agents; and conſequently, God Almighty may be juſtly ſaid to do what Chriſt

and

and the Holy Spirit perform, as they receive their power, authority, and commiſſion from him, and act in all things, according to the will and pleaſure of the one ſupreme God and Father of all. To argue that God muſt mean Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, becauſe the ſame operations are aſcribed to God, which are applied to Chriſt and the Holy Spirit, is a groſs perverſion of Scripture language, and ſentiment: beſides, it is expreſsly contrary to the ſolemn determination of St. Paul himſelf, and particularly in verſe the 3d of this chapter, where the word, God, neceſſarily means the Father, according to your own interpretation, the Son and Holy Spirit being mentioned with, and diſtinguiſhed from him. No poſſible reaſon can be aſſigned, why the word, God, in the 6th verſe, ſhould not ſignify the Father, as he is clearly diſtinguiſhed from the Lord, and the Spirit. Add to this, the abſurdity of ſuppoſing the Apoſtle to mention the Spirit and Lord particularly, and then to include them in the notion of God, without any expreſs mention of the Perſon of the Father at all. As to the word, God, in the 28th verſe, it certainly means the Father, he being plainly diſtinguiſhed from Chriſt, Ver. 27. There is no ſort of difficulty according to Scripture, though the ſame thing is applied to Chriſt, ver. 11. of the 4th chap. of Epheſians, that is in this verſe, namely 28th, attributed to God: Chriſt may be properly ſaid, to give Apoſtles and Prophets, becauſe he received a commiſſion from God, or the Father, to employ the Holy Spirit in appointing various officers in the Church; and the very ſame thing may be juſtly applied to God, becauſe the whole tranſaction was derived from his ſupreme authority.

You obſerve, that "the texts produced in the Appeal, p. 11, 13, 2d edit. to ſhew that the term God means the Father, do yet only ſhew, that the Father is eminently, and not excluſively, called God: otherwiſe, the context of the above paſſages, are utterly inconſiſtent with the other parts of ſcripture." Page 16.

Anſ. If the Father be eminently ſtiled God, which you are obliged to grant, it neceſſarily follows, that the Father is God, in an higher ſenſe than the Son and Holy Spirit; which conceſſion demoliſhes the whole ſcheme you are labouring to ſupport; for this neceſſarily ſuppoſes the Son and Holy Spirit, to be in ſome ſenſe inferior to the Father: but how to reconcile the notion of three Perſons, being equal in *all eſſential perfections*, with that of one of them being eminently ſtiled God, and the other two being in *ſome ſenſe inferior*, is impoſſible to be conceived. As to your expreſſion, *not excluſively*, I ſhall conſider it in my anſwer to your 18th page. I have plainly proved, that the context of the above paſſages, is exactly agreeable to the other parts of Scripture.

In the Appeal, p. 13. 2d edit. there are paſſages produced, which deſcribe the Father with very high and peculiar titles and attributes. In anſwer to this you obſerve, that "the high titles given to the Father, are not, as you aſſert, ſo peculiar to him, but moſt of them are alſo applied to Chriſt; for, Acts x. 36. he is expreſsly called, *Lord of all*, and he is ſaid to have created all things; which plainly implies him to be Lord of Heaven and Earth. He is twice, John iii. 31. ſaid to be above all; and therefore ſupreme, or moſt high: nay, Luke i. 76. he is expreſsly called the moſt High, as the context of the paſſage, and the application

application therein of the words of the Prophet Malach. iii. 1. iv. 5. and the office of the Baptiſt do clearly prove. Again, his divine nature is certainly inviſible; and to that the deſcription 1 Tim. vi. 16. agrees as exactly as to the Father: the Lord Almighty in Revel. i. 4. is as much his character, as the Father's; as will be more particularly ſhewn hereafter. And the Lamb is equally deſcribed ſitting on the throne, expreſsly called King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, and the great God. Revel. xx. 11, 12. compared with Matth. xxv. 31. Acts x. 42. Revel. xix. 9, 16, 17. but that the Father is properly called the Head of Chriſt, by no means contradicts any of theſe paſſages, as being the firſt in rank and order, and the fountain of the divinity; but more eſpecially with regard to Chriſt's mediatorial office." Page 16, 17.

Anſ. The high titles which I have ſelected from the New Teſtament, as appropriated to the Father, are never applied to Chriſt, or the Holy Ghoſt, as will appear by going over the particulars, you have alledged to prove the contrary. The title of *Lord of all*, which is applied to Chriſt, Acts x. 36. is not of the ſame import with ſupreme, or moſt high, appropriated to the Father, which is very plain from the verſe itſelf; *The word which God ſent unto the Children of Iſrael, preaching peace by Jeſus Chriſt (he is Lord of all).* Here Chriſt is repreſented not only as diſtinct from, but likewiſe acting in ſubordination to, Almighty God. Beſides, it is the ſolemn determination of St. Peter, who has given this title to Chriſt, that God hath *made* that ſame Jeſus whom the Jews crucified, both *Lord and Chriſt*: we muſt acknowledge Chriſt to be *Lord of all*, that is, Head of the Church, conſiſting of Jews and Gentiles, but certainly *made ſo* by

by the one ſupreme Lord of Heaven and Earth. As to creation, Chriſt is conſtantly ſet forth in Scripture as an inſtrument, through whom, or by whoſe miniſtry, God created all things, which is ſo far from implying him to be Lord of Heaven and Earth, in as high a ſenſe as the Father, that the very form of the expreſſion undeniably demonſtrates the contrary; and remarkable it is, that Chriſt has no ſort of worſhip, or glory, aſcribed to him in Scripture, upon account of his inferior agency in the work of creation.

John iii. 31. Chriſt is ſaid twice to be *above all*; but he is expreſsly declared to be ſo, upon account of his coming from Heaven, and in preference to John, and all other Prophets, they being the words of John, diſclaiming all pretenſions of being equal to Chriſt, who came from heaven. It is obſervable, that Chriſt is twice deſcribed as inferior to God, or the Father, v. 34. *For he whom* God hath ſent, *ſpeaketh the words of God*; *for* God giveth not *the Spirit by meaſure unto him.*

Luke i. 76. That the title of moſt High, ſhould in this particular text be applied to Chriſt, is contrary to the whole tenor of the New Teſtament, it being appropriated to the Father in every other paſſage where it occurs: more particularly in this chapter, v. 32. Chriſt is ſtiled the Son of the moſt High; and v. 35. the moſt High is expreſsly diſtinguiſhed from the Son and Holy Ghoſt. See likewiſe Mark v. 7. Luke vi. 35. Luke viii. 28. As to the text produced, namely, Luke i. 76. it is part of Zacharias's prophecy upon the birth of John: now, it is very unreaſonable to ſuppoſe, that he ſhould give the title of moſt High to the Meſſias, in expreſs contradiction to the ſentiments of all the Jews, who never entertained any ſuch opinion,

opinion, and likewiſe to the whole deſign of his diſcourſe, which was principally to celebrate the praiſes of the Lord God of Iſrael, as he ſtiles him, v. 68. and, therefore, he muſt neceſſarily mean the ſame perſon, by this title of moſt High, which was uſually aſcribed to the one ſupreme God in the Old Teſtament. John the Baptiſt might very juſtly be ſtiled the Prophet of the moſt High, as he was inſpired by the Spirit of God, and was the immediate fore-runner of the Meſſias, through whom the ſalvation of God was made known to the ſons of men. You refer to the Prophet Malach. iii. 1. iv. 5. and to the office of the Baptiſt, as clearly proving that the moſt High is meant of Chriſt. The argument you would deduce from hence is this: John the Baptiſt was the fore-runner of Chriſt, whoſe office it was to prepare the way before him. But the Lord of Hoſts is repreſented as ſpeaking in his own Perſon, and propheſying of John the Baptiſt, as preparing the way before him, namely, Lord of Hoſts. The day of the Lord likewiſe means the day of the one ſupreme God, Jehovah. And this is confirmed by the words of Zacharias; *Thou ſhalt go before the Face of the Lord to prepare his ways*: the Lord here muſt mean the ſame perſon as the higheſt. I have endeavoured to repreſent your argument as plainly and ſtrongly as you could wiſh yourſelf, to which I anſwer: It is taken for granted, that John the Baptiſt did not prepare the way before the face of any perſon but of Chriſt; whereas it may not only be properly ſaid, that he prepared the way before God, as Chriſt repreſented the Perſon of God, whilſt he lived upon earth, but likewiſe becauſe he exhorted the people to repentance, and to be converted to God, which was preparing the way be-

fore God as well as Chriſt; which ſenſe is confirmed by the words of the Prophet Malachi immediately following, namely, verſe 6th of the 4th chapter, compared with the completion of this prophecy, according to the explication delivered by the Angel to Zacharias. Luke i. 17. John the Baptiſt, by exhorting the people to repentance, converted them to God as diſtinguiſhed from Chriſt, as plainly appears from the words of St. Paul, Acts xx. 21. Teſtifying to the Jews and Gentiles repentance towards God, and Faith in our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. It is obſervable with reſpect to Malachi iii. 1. that the *Lord of Hoſts*, namely, *Jehovah*, is expreſsly diſtinguiſhed from *the Lord*, namely, *Adon*, deſcribed by the character of *the Meſſenger of the Covenant*; *He*, namely, *Adon*, ſhall come, ſaith *the Lord of Hoſts*, namely, *Jehovah*. To which let it be added, though the Meſſenger, namely, John, is propheſied to prepare the way before *me*, according to the preſent Hebrew and Greek copies, meaning thereby the Lord of Hoſts, of which a good account may be given; yet in Matth. xi. 10. Mark i. 2. and Luke vii. 27. it is expreſsly cited thus, *Behold, I ſend my Meſſenger before* thy *Face, which ſhall prepare thy way before thee*, namely, Chriſt, which doubtleſs was the true reading in our Saviour's time. This abſolutely overthrows the force of your argument, deduced from Malachi iii. 1.

1 Tim. vi. 16. The Father is moſt certainly deſcribed by the characters in this and the foregoing verſe; the greater part of theſe is never applied to Chriſt, particularly, *whom no man hath ſeen, or can ſee*, agreeably to the declaration of our Saviour, *No man hath ſeen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is, or was, in the boſom of the Father,*

he hath declared him. John i. 18. Again, the Father is called, *the inviſible God*, as diſtinguiſhed from Chriſt. Coloſs. i. 15. You obſerve that our Saviour's divine nature is certainly inviſible; his ſpiritual and divine part doubtleſs is ſo, and ſo are the ſouls of men. As it would be abſurd to ſtyle a man inviſible, ſo our Saviour has this character never aſcribed to him.

Revel. i. 8. Which is the only text produced, to prove that Chriſt is ſtiled Lord God Almighty, ſhall be conſidered in its proper place.

As to the Lamb being equally deſcribed, ſitting on the throne with the Father, Revel. iii. 21. he is in the very words ſet forth, not only as diſtinct from the Father, but inferior to him. *To him that overcometh, will I grant to ſit with me in my Throne, even as I alſo overcame, and am ſet down with my Father in his Throne.* This declaration, if it proves our Saviour's equality with the Father, will equally prove that the Saints in glory will be equal to Chriſt. The reaſon expreſsly aſſigned for this extraordinary honour, namely, becauſe he overcame and performed a ſteady obedience to his God and Father, under all trials and temptations, demonſtrates the abſurdity of making him equal to his ſupreme Father whom he *obeyed*, and by whom he was raiſed to ſuper-eminent dignity, upon account of his obedience.

Revel. xvii. 14.—xix. 16. The Lamb is ſtiled King of Kings and Lord of Lords. But it is plainly declared by the ſacred writers, that God *made* him Lord of Lords, and that God ſet him at his own right hand, Acts ii. 36. Epheſ. i. 20, 21, 22. The Father, according to the ſtrict propriety of the Greek language, is, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, in the higheſt and moſt

moſt abſolute ſenſe; but the Son is a King of Kings and Lord of Lords in a lower ſenſe, and by the appointment of the ſupreme God and Lord of all, the Son himſelf not excepted. We are frequently aſſured by the ſacred writers, that all the power and authority, with which Chriſt is inveſted, is derived from his God and Father.

By comparing Revel. xx. 11, 12. with Matth. xxv. 31, and Acts x. 42. it will appear that, as Chriſt is appointed by God to judge the quick and dead, it may be properly ſaid that the dead ſtand before God, when they ſtand before Chriſt's judgment-ſeat, who received his commiſſion from God to execute this important buſineſs. Thus Rom. xiv. 10, 11, 12. we ſhall all ſtand before the judgment-ſeat of Chriſt. For it is written, *as I live, ſaith the Lord, every knee ſhall bow to me, and every tongue ſhall confeſs to God.* So then every one of us ſhall give account of himſelf to God. Here ſtanding before Chriſt's judgment-ſeat, confeſſing to God, according to Iſaiah, and giving account to God, evidently denote the ſame important tranſaction. And what follows from hence? You would infer that God and Chriſt are the ſame Being; which is not only abſurd, but expreſsly contradicted in numberleſs paſſages of Scripture: ſurely, it requires no great ſkill to underſtand, that giving account to Chriſt, by whom God judges the world, is exactly of the ſame import with giving account to God, who judges the world by Chriſt.

By referring to Revel. xix. 9, 16, 17. you would infer, that the marriage-ſupper of the Lamb, and the ſupper of the great God, mean the ſame thing; and therefore, the Lamb is the great God. Admitting the fact, your inference would not hold.

But theſe texts, when carefully examined, appear to deſcribe quite different tranſactions. The marriage-ſupper of the Lamb was evidently deſigned to repreſent the glorious ſtate of the Church, under the ſimilitude of a wedding, ver. 7, 8, 9. when it was cuſtomary for bridegrooms at their marriage to preſent their brides with coſtly ornaments; ſo likewiſe the Church, which is ſtiled the Spouſe of the Lamb, is deſcribed with the valuable ornaments of purity, righteouſneſs, and holineſs. This part of the prophetic viſion is fully compleated at the 9th verſe, which plainly appears from the following verſe. At ver. 11. a new ſcene was preſented to St. John, in which Chriſt is repreſented in a triumphant manner, ver. 12. and ver. 13. he is ſtiled the word of God; ver. 15. he is deſcribed as treading the wine-preſs of the fierceneſs and wrath of Almighty God, that is, as executing the judgments of Almighty God upon the enemies of truth and virtue; ver. 16. he is deſcribed as having an inſcription on one part of his garment which covered his thigh, the place where the ſword was uſually wore, in which he was ſtiled King of Kings and Lord of Lords, to denote his real poſſeſſion of a rightful dominion over all the princes and kingdoms of the earth; he ſeems to have this grand title in alluſion to eaſtern monarchs and the emperors of the Roman empire, who preſumptuouſly claimed this title to themſelves; ver. 17. In conſequence of this mighty general's marching with his army, an Angel denounces a terrible deſtruction upon the enemies of God, under the repreſentation of inviting the birds of prey to the carcaſes of the ſlain, as to a great feaſt, which the vengeance of the Almighty would ſoon entertain them with. The ſupper of the great God,

God, (or, as ſome manuſcripts read it, the great ſupper of God) neceſſarily refers to the wrath of Almighty God, ver. 15. and alludes to a paſſage in the prophet Ezekiel xxxix. 17, 18, 19, 20. The ſupper of the Lamb was intended to ſet forth the holy ſtate of the Chriſtian Church upon the fall of Babylon; and the ſupper of the great God, plainly points out the final deſtruction of the enemies of God and virtue.

You obſerve in the next place, that the Father by being called the head of Chriſt, by no means contradicts any of the paſſages you have produced, he being the firſt in rank and order, and the fountain of the divinity: I agree with you that this declaration does not really contradict any thing ſaid of Chriſt, in the New Teſtament, his inferiority to his God and Father, being plainly ſet forth in great numbers of paſſages as well as this; which indeed are ſo very ſtrong, that they often extort conceſſions from you and other Athanaſians, deſtructive of your whole ſcheme. If the Father be really firſt in rank and order, and the fountain of the divinity, it neceſſarily follows that he is the one ſupreme God, and from him is derived all the divinity aſcribed to Chriſt. But it is beyond my imagination to conceive, how you can make this conſiſtent with the avowed plan of your anſwer, which is to prove that the Son and Holy Spirit are equally divine with the Father, and have the ſame eſſential perfections. This reduced to plain ſenſe and language, conveys an evident contradiction: the Son and Holy Spirit are equally ſupreme with the Father, excepting that they muſt be allowed to be inferior.

The concluſion you draw from your obſervations on this head, is this: "And hence admitting the

eſtabliſhed doctrine of our Church, you ſee it is not ſo impoſſible, as you would have it to be, to account for the language that runs through every part of the New Teſtament, which, contrary to your aſſertion, ſtrongly inculcates, that the term God, when uſed ſingly and alone, is applicable to the three Perſons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, taken together; but when uſed with either, or both of the two latter, it then, for the moſt part, eminently means the Perſon of the Father; but never is the Father deſcribed, as you moſt peremptorily and falſely aſſert he is, the God of the Holy Ghoſt." Page 17.

Anſ. Very true; admitting the eſtabliſhed doctrine of our Church: let the Creeds and Articles eſtabliſhed by law, be conſidered as the rule of our faith and profeſſions; let the doctrine of three Perſons and one God be allowed a fundamental principle of religion, and then it will not be impoſſible to account for the language of the New Teſtament; and eſpecially, if a method of interpretation be fixed upon, that never was practiſed upon any other book: let words have no determinate meaning, but let them be ſuppoſed to ſignify whatever ſuits the eſtabliſhed doctrine; let a word neceſſarily ſignifying one Perſon, in all books and languages, be admitted to denote three, or three hundred, and let three have the priviledge of denoting one; upon theſe principles I fairly grant you, that God in the New Teſtament ſignifies Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, when uſed ſingly and alone. You have not produced the leaſt tittle of evidence to ſhew; that the word, God, in the New Teſtament, ever ſignifies Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. I have purſued you ſtep by ſtep, and plainly demonſtrated the abſurdity of what you have offered upon

this

this head, upon which your whole ſcheme depends. The Father, indeed, is never expreſsly ſtiled the God of the Holy Ghoſt. My words are theſe: the Father is often deſcribed as abſolutely ſupreme, the God of all, the Son and Holy Spirit not excepted. But that the Father is the God of the Holy Spirit, is ſtrongly implied, as he ſent him, and is expreſsly ſtiled the God of *all*, which ought to be underſtood without any exception; for Chriſt himſelf profeſſes the Father to be his God, and therefore the Father is ſurely the God of the Holy Spirit, whom he employs as an inferior inſtrument in the government of the Church.

As to the texts, which are quoted in the Appeal, p. 12, 13. 2d edit. to prove that God, according to the uſual language of the New Teſtament, ſignifies the Father only, you obſerve, "That they only ſhew, that the Father is eminently, and not excluſively, called God," p. 16, 18. *Anſ. Eminently*, I have conſidered already; I want to fix the preciſe idea of *not excluſively:* if by this you mean that the Son and Holy Spirit are included in the term God, then the glaring abſurdity of ſuch an interpretation neceſſarily takes place, which I have mentioned, p. 14, 15. Appeal, 2d edit. and which appears ſo ſtrong, even to yourſelf, that you are very ſevere upon me for the ſuppoſition, that God in theſe texts ſhould ſignify Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. If by *not excluſively*, you mean that though the Father be *eminently* ſtiled God, yet the Son and Holy Spirit, are God too in as high a ſenſe as the Father, this ſenſe contains an evident contradiction; the Father is *eminently* ſtiled God, and yet the Son and Holy Spirit, are God too in as high a ſenſe as the Father; that is, they too are *eminently* God: ſo that, if *not excluſively* be taken in the former ſenſe, which ſeems to be the true idea of the term.

The ſeverity of your animadverſion, p. 18. falls upon your own head; you have then, according to your own expreſſions, *miſguided your Chriſtian Readers* in ſuch a way, *that none but* they *who are reſolutely bent to pervert and diſguiſe the truth, could ſtoop to ſuch low and diſingenuous handling of the ſacred word of God.* If *not excluſively*, be taken in the latter ſenſe, you are involved in a palpable contradiction. I would juſt obſerve with reſpect to your animadverſion, that I neither miſguided my Chriſtian readers, nor perverted the Scripture; my view evidently was, to demonſtrate the falſhood of the Athanaſian doctrine, by arguing from the abſurdity neceſſarily ariſing from Scripture, being interpreted conſiſtently with that hypotheſis, which is one uſeful method of detecting errors: I have indeed repreſented it ſo plainly, that you are obliged to acknowledge the Perſon of the Father, to be neceſſarily meant by God, in the texts cited for that purpoſe, and all others of a like nature; which is a conſiderable point gained, towards the deciſion of this famous controverſy.

The rule you would fix upon for the interpretation of the New Teſtament, is this: "When the word God is uſed ſingly and alone, it then denotes the whole Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; and then only it ſignifies the Perſon of the Father; when the other Perſons of the Trinity are mentioned with it." Pages 17, 18.

Anſ. Let this rule be illuſtrated by particular inſtances: God anointed Jeſus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghoſt, Acts x. 38. According to this rule, God neceſſarily ſignifies the Father, and ſo far we are uniformly agreed. There are in the New Teſtament above three hundred paſſages of this kind, which, according to your own rule, neceſſarily confine the word, God, to the Perſon of

the Father only. I refer you to Dr. Clarke's ſcripture doctrine of the Trinity, chap. i. ſect. 2. where this is demonſtrated to eye-ſight. It is proper to add, that the third ſection of ſcripture doctrine, *&c.* contains about an hundred paſſages, wherein the Father is ſtiled God, with ſome peculiar high titles, epithets, or attributes. It is highly reaſonable to underſtand the word, God, in the ſame ſenſe in other paſſages of the New Teſtament, excepting where the title of God is given to Chriſt, or other Beings, as it ſometimes is.

On the other hand, let us take any text in the New Teſtament, where God is uſed ſingly and alone, which, according to the rule you have fixed upon, muſt ſignify Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. John iv. 24. *God* is a ſpirit, and they that worſhip *him*, muſt worſhip *him* in ſpirit and in truth; that is, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, is a ſpirit, and they that worſhip *him*, that is, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, muſt worſhip *him*, that is, them in ſpirit and in truth. Revel. iv. 11. Thou *art worthy*, O Lord, *to receive glory, and honour, and power*; *for* thou *haſt created all things, and for* thy *pleaſure they are, and were created. Thou, O Lord, that is, thou, O Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt.* Theſe inſtances are ſufficient to demonſtrate the abſurdity of ſuch an interpretation, as would make almoſt as groſs nonſenſe of ſeveral hundred paſſages, as I have taken notice of p. 14. of Appeal, 2d edit. If *I*, *thou*, *him*, do not neceſſarily point out one Perſon, the uſe of language muſt be deſtroyed, and the greateſt confuſion muſt be introduced into the ſacred writings. I challenge you to produce ſo much as one paſſage, where the word, God, neceſſarily conveys the idea of three Perſons; I ſay neceſſarily, for if the word be only capable of the uſual ſenſe, this ought to be admitted in order to make

make it conſiſtent with ſeveral hundred paſſages, which, according to your own rule, extorted from you by the glaring abſurdity of the contrary interpretation, muſt be underſtood of the Father only. In every paſſage where the word, God occurs in the New Teſtament, it always, according to common ſenſe and language, denotes one Perſon. When the one, or only God, or when God is mentioned abſolutely, and by way of eminence, the Perſon of the Father is always denoted. The moſt judicious defenders of the Athanaſian doctrine readily grant, that the name of God taken abſolutely, is often in the Scriptures ſpoken of the Father. (*See Pearſon on the Creed*, p. 40.)

When you obſerve that "three Perſons and one God are as directly revealed, or plainly implied in the Scriptures, as it is upon that authority, the expreſs determination of the Athanaſian creed:" You ſhould have ſaid, provided the Athanaſian creed be conſidered as the grand rule of faith, and that we ought to interpret Scripture in conformity to it; it is poſſible by far-fetched deductions and an arbitrary perverſion of language and ſentiment, to make the Scripture and Athanaſian Creed agree together. But let the propoſitions of Scripture relating to the Trinity, and the Athanaſian Creed be compared, they appear as contradictory to each other, as light is to darkneſs.

Thus I have particularly conſidered, every article you have alledged in order to undermine the foundation I had laid upon Scripture, interpreted by common ſenſe; and upon the moſt impartial review am deeply convinced, that the Appeal has ſo far proceeded upon ſure and certain grounds. It is the clear voice of reaſon that God is one; and it is no leſs clearly revealed by Chriſt and his Apoſtles,

Apoſtles, that the one God is the Father only, as diſtinguiſhed from Chriſt and the Holy Spirit. It is indeed a truth that ſhines ſo ſtrongly before your eyes, that you cannot help acknowledging it at the very time you are labouring to overthrow it; for you allow the Father to be *eminently*, though *not excluſively*, *the only God*. If the Father be *eminently* the only God, it neceſſarily follows that he is the one ſupreme God; ſo that we ſeem agreed in this important point: which conceſſion uniformly purſued, would produce an happy agreement in the Trinitarian controverſy, if you did not take pains to darken the light that you cannot poſſibly extinguiſh. As to the diſtinction you inſinuate, by the expreſſion, *not excluſively*, I have already ſhown that, when it is reduced to plain Engliſh, it either implies an interpretation that you expreſsly condemn, or elſe it contains an evident contradiction.

I now proceed, to conſider what you have offered to invalidate my obſervations on the texts, particularly relating to the Son and Holy Spirit.

Matth. vii. 21. I gave the natural ſenſe of theſe words, when I obſerved, that the Father is the firſt and original author of our ſalvation, and that our Saviour refers every thing to his honour and glory; and therefore, he cannot be ſuppoſed of equal dignity with his God and Father.

In anſwer to this, you labour to ſhew, that "the will of the Father, and the will of the Son are the ſame, and that the complying with that will, muſt redound as much to the honour of the one as of the other." Again, you endeavour to prove that, "as the will of the Son is the ſame with the will of the Father, the Son muſt be equally perfect with the Father, he muſt be equal to

to him in all reſpects, excepting in that of being the Son, becauſe it is always poſſible for an imperfect being to deviate from the will of a perfect one; but two perfect beings are a plain contradiction: the Son, therefore, muſt be one with the Father, one in nature and eſſence, and not meerly in will and power." Page 18, 19, 20.

Anſ. The will of the Father and of the Son may, in a very good ſenſe, be ſaid to be the ſame, becauſe the Son always acted in obedience to his Father's will. But when you infer that complying with that will, redounds as much to the honour of the one as of the other, you are directly anſwered by our Saviour's words, referred to under this article, and indeed, by the whole tenour of our Lord's diſcourſes, which plainly and powerfully refer all he ſaid, and did, to the ultimate glory of the Father who *ſent* him. Let a few declarations of our Lord be produced: John vi. 37, 38, 39, 40. *I came down from Heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of him that ſent me. And this is the Father's will which hath ſent me, that of all which he hath given me, I ſhould loſe nothing, but ſhould raiſe it up again at the laſt day, And this is the will of him that ſent me,* &c. Again, John vii. 16, 17, 18. *My doctrine is not mine, but his that ſent me. If any man will do his will, he ſhall know of the doctrine whether it be of God, or whether I ſpeak of myſelf. He that ſpeaketh of himſelf, ſeeketh his own glory; but he that ſeeketh his glory that ſent him, the ſame is true, and no unrighteouſneſs is in him.* If theſe plain and ſtrong declarations, to which many others might be added, do not neceſſarily ſignify, that the whole ſcheme of the Goſpel diſpenſation came originally from the one ſupreme God and Father of all; and that

Chriſt

Chriſt was a miniſter ſent from heaven to execute the will of God; and that the glory of the Father, was the grand ſcope of all his diſcourſes and actions: if this, I ſay, be not the ſenſe of ſuch plain declarations, I muſt deſpair of underſtanding any thing that is written for the uſe of man; in which caſe, the Scripture is no Scripture, to my underſtanding.——Again, when you argue that the Son muſt be as perfect as the Father, becauſe his will is exactly the ſame with the Father's, there being always a poſſibility for an imperfect being, to deviate from the will of a perfect being; this argument proves too much, namely, that God cannot employ any inferior being, to communicate his will to his creatures, becauſe it is poſſible they may be deceived: the Jews could not have any rational conviction that Moſes delivered the will of God, though he worked miracles, becauſe he was an imperfect Being, and capable of deviating from the will of the Almighty. And with reſpect to Chriſt himſelf, though he always performed an uniform obedience to his God and Father, though he did no ſin, yet it was ſtill poſſible for him to deviate from the will of his Father; in which caſe, he cannot be abſolutely depended upon, though he proved his commiſſion from God by working miracles, and delivered a doctrine worthy of God: in a word, we can never be aſſured, that the will of Chriſt was the ſame with the will of the Father, unleſs we ſuppoſe him equally perfect with the Father. Such ſort of arguments are ſufficiently anſwered, by repeating them.

Again, when you argue that the Son muſt have the ſame nature, or eſſence with the Father, becauſe they have the ſame will; you argue without the

the leaſt grounds from Scripture, which never ſays one word about their common nature, or eſſence. As Chriſt received a commiſſion from God, to declare his will to mankind, which he undeniably proved by miracles, his reſurrection, and the nature of the doctrine itſelf; ſurely, we may be juſtly ſaid to perform the will of God, when we perform the will of Chriſt; in which ſenſe the will of Chriſt is the ſame with the will of God, they being certainly ſo, with regard to the terms and conditions, on which our ſalvation depends. But how does it follow from hence, that they have the ſame nature and eſſence? This is the invention of men without any warrant from the word of God, which has conſtantly repreſented God and Chriſt as two diſtinct beings, in numberleſs expreſſions incapable of any other ſenſe.

What occaſions all your confuſion upon this ſubject is, that you firſt take it for granted, that God and Chriſt are one being, and therefore they have the ſame nature, and the ſame individual will: preſuming upon the truth of this notion, you conſider every declaration of Scripture, expreſſing, or implying, an agreement or union in any reſpect between the Father and Son, as an argument in favour of their conſubſtantial nature, of which the Scripture is abſolutely ſilent; and what you alledge in proof of it, ſuppoſes the point in queſtion.

John x. 30. ſhall be conſidered in its proper place.

Matth. x. 40. It has been juſtly argued from this, and other texts of the like nature, that, as the Son was ſent by his God and Father, he muſt be a perſon inferior to God, of whom it would be little leſs than blaſphemy to affirm, that he

could act as embaſſador to the will of another perſon.

In anſwer to this, you obſerve that God here ſignifies the Father, in which we are agreed; for the word never ſignifies Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. You add, that "Chriſt, ſpeaking of God who ſent him, no where calls him abſolutely, Almighty God; but my Father, which is in heaven, or my God, and, my Father."

But ſurely, when our Saviour ſtiles him *Lord of Heaven and Earth*, and *my God*, it is of the ſame import with Almighty God. In the next words you cannot help expreſſing the truth, which you are labouring to confound; for if *the Father be ſtiled the God and Father of Chriſt, by way of eminence, and on account of his being the ſender*, which you expreſsly grant, it neceſſarily follows, that he is the one ſupreme God, as being the God and Father of the greateſt Perſon, in the whole inviſible world, the Father excepted.

You contend, "that two perſons equal in every reſpect, may yet have ſuch connexions, and the circumſtances of their affairs may ſo require it, as that the one ſhould actually ſend the other to tranſact his buſineſs, the latter indeed conſenting thereto, the miſſion by no means rendering him inferior to the ſender. Have not princes acted in this manner? Have not the joint kings of Sparta, and the collegue conſuls of Rome done this? And were any of theſe by being thus employed, looked upon to be inferior to the employer; though he even declines, for the time, the diſplay of his own authority, and ſpeaks in the name of the ſender?" Pages 20, 21.

Anſ. If two perſons are equal in all reſpects, one cannot ſend the other upon any buſineſs, without

out mutual conſent. The conſent makes a wide difference in the caſe as you have ſtated it; for by virtue of this, he acts upon his own authority, as well as the other's: and, doubtleſs, there may be inſtances produced among men, where perſons, otherwiſe of equal dignity, may condeſcend to act a miniſterial part, or to perform the office of embaſſadors. But the fallaciouſneſs of this argument appears from hence, that you argue from human tranſactions, to divine, which will by no means hold in this particular inſtance. If the two caſes be exactly parallel, no reaſon can be aſſigned, why the Father might not be ſent by the Son and Holy Spirit, as well as the Son and Spirit be ſent by the Father. But that the ſupreme Father cannot poſſibly be ſent by the Son, or Holy Spirit, is uniformly agreed by the moſt judicious defenders of the Athanaſian doctrine. [*See Pearſon on the Creed*, p. 36. *and biſhop Bull.*] It is, indeed, blaſphemy to aſſert that the one ſupreme God and Father of all, ſhould be ſent by any perſon whatſoever. There is therefore an eſſential difference between the two caſes, the reaſon of which is this: no man is ſo great, but he may condeſcend upon a particular occaſion, to act a miniſterial part; and therefore, a perſon who is equal to another in dignity, or even ſuperior, may be ſent and perform an embaſſy in his name; and with regard to a particular buſineſs, may act in ſubſervience to his will, as an inferior. But the one ſupreme God is abſolutely incapable of any ſuch change, as to become inferior to any perſon, or being, upon any account whatſoever, or be ſubſervient to the will of any being: but he is at all times neceſſarily ſupreme over all perſons and beings, and all miniſter to him as the one ſupreme Lord of the Univerſe.

It is infinitely abſurd and impoſſible to ſuppoſe, that the great Almighty Being ſhould undertake the office of embaſſador. The true reaſon why the ſupreme Father cannot be ſent, is becauſe miſſion implies an inferiority with regard to the buſineſs on which he is ſent, and neceſſarily ſuppoſes the perſon ſent, miniſtering to the will of another, as his principal; and, conſequently, it follows from hence, that Chriſt cannot poſſibly be equal to the Father, becauſe he was ſent by the Father: and therefore, I had the higheſt reaſon drawn from common ſenſe to conclude, that, as certain as our Lord and Maſter Jeſus Chriſt, was ſent by his God and Father, ſo certain is it, that he is inferior to the one ſupreme Lord of heaven and earth, of whom it would be blaſphemous to affirm, that he could act as embaſſador to the will of another perſon. You acknowledge Chriſt to be *inferior* to his Father, as a *Son*, and alſo with regard to *office*; yet you maintain they are both *equal* in reſpect of *nature*. You muſt be frequently re-minded, that the Scripture is abſolutely ſilent about nature, or eſſence; this was invented by men, to reconcile palpable contradictions.

John v. 30. From theſe words, and the whole deſign of our Lord's diſcourſe, I argued that nothing can be more plainly expreſſed, than the inferiority of Chriſt to Almighty God; it being very abſurd to affirm of God, that he has no power of himſelf, and that all his ability is derived from another perſon, which is abſolutely inconſiſtent with the notion of equality with his God and Father, from whom he profeſſes to have received all his powers. You anſwer thus: "You take the word, God, abſolutely, and then ſhew how abſurd it would be for God to declare of himſelf in

ſuch a manner. Whereas Chriſt here ſpeaks of himſelf in the Perſon of the Son; who therefore deriving his eſſence from the Perſon of the Father, muſt conſequently with that derive all his power, *&c.* from the ſame perſon; and therefore very properly ſays, I can of mine own ſelf do nothing; that is, as he before, verſe 19. explains himſelf; I who am the truly begotten Son of the Father, and having thereby the ſame nature derived to me, and conſequently the ſame power and the ſame will, can do nothing of myſelf, but what I ſee my Father do.——Agreeably to that ſhort, but expreſſive juſtification of himſelf, verſe 17. upon the reſentment of the Jews, at his healing the impotent man on the Sabbath Day, My Father worketh hitherto, (even till now from all eternity) and I work; intimating, that as his Father is free from the obſervation of Sabbaths, an injunction ſuited to the incapacities of his creatures, and worketh from all eternity, without the leaſt intermiſſion, works of benevolence; ſo the Son worketh in the ſelf-ſame manner, ſuperior, equally with the Father, to the ſame injunctions; thereby plainly aſſuming to himſelf, powers and privileges equal to thoſe of the Father. For certainly, the Jews took it in that ſenſe, nor doth he endeavour to ſhew that they were miſtaken; but inſiſting upon his being the Son of God; and conſequently, as they naturally inferred, equal with God, lays open to them, upon that principle, the reaſonableneſs of his aſſertion, and the neceſſary communication of all his Father's power to his beloved Son, together with ſome of the more remarkable inſtances, wherein his actual poſſeſſion of ſuch power ſhould be exemplified; which inſtances, as they comprehend Omnipotence itſelf; and as his expreſſion,

verſe

verſe 30. ſhews it to be no leſs than the power of the Father, communicated to him; ſo what he ſays, verſe 17. ſhews the communication to be eternal; and the Son, to whom it is communicated, to be of an eternal nature perſonally ſubſiſting, and conſequently, of the ſame eternal nature with the Father." Pages 21—23.

Anſ. It is the profeſſed deſign of your anſwer to prove, that Chriſt is God in as high a ſenſe as the Father. Now Chriſt, when he profeſſes to be able to do nothing of himſelf, diſclaims all pretenſions to an equality with God, or the Father (for I muſt remind you, that God abſolutely taken, always means the Father), as ſtrongly as words can expreſs it. A perſon who is ſupreme God, cannot make any ſuch declaration, conſiſtently with common ſenſe. It is true, Chriſt ſpeaks here in the perſon of the Son; for he never ſpeaks otherwiſe of himſelf: it is likewiſe true, that Chriſt may very properly ſay, *I can of mine ownſelf do nothing*, as he derives his eſſence from the Father, and conſequently all his power; which conceſſion neceſſarily overthrows the whole ſcheme you are labouring to ſupport. If the Father be the perſon, from whom Chriſt derives his eſſence and all his powers, he muſt be acknowledged to be the one ſupreme God. It is an expreſs contradiction to affirm, that a derived Being can be ſupreme God. But when you argue that, becauſe Chriſt ſpeaks of himſelf as Son of the Father; therefore he has the *ſame nature* derived to him, and conſequently the *ſame power* and the *ſame will*, you draw a concluſion from this character of our Saviour, without any warrant from Scripture, which has determined nothing about Nature or Eſſence, on which you perpetually lay the ſtreſs of the whole affair. Be-

ſides, it is abſolutely impoſſible that God ſhould communicate his very nature and attributes to the Son, which in other terms is making the Son the ſame perſon with the Father. For what is any perſon, or being, but his individual nature and attributes, by which he is what he is, as diſtinguiſhed from other perſons, or beings?

It may be worth while to examine, the preciſe notion of the Son of God, from the expreſs determination of Scripture: Son of God is applied to ſeveral other perſons beſides our Saviour; but doubtleſs, it is aſcribed to him in a more eminent manner than any other being. The Angels are called the Sons of God, Job xxxviii. 7. and Adam is ſtiled the Son of God, Luke iii. 38. becauſe he was immediately created by him: good Chriſtians are called the Sons of God, becauſe they obey him as their heavenly Father, and ſo are members of his family, Rom. viii. 14. They who ſhall attain eternal life, are ſtiled the Sons of God, becauſe they are in full poſſeſſion of the inheritance they have received from their God and Father, Luke xx. 36. They who have received any high office by the particular deſignation of God, are called Gods, or Sons of God, becauſe they act by an immediate commiſſion from him, John x. 34. In theſe, and poſſibly ſome other ſenſes, the Scripture gives the grand title of Sons of God, to Angels and Men. And the true reaſon of this appellation, is obſervable either from the words themſelves, or at leaſt is plainly implied. Neither is our Saviour ſtiled, Son of God, upon the ſame account: he has this title, becauſe he was born of the virgin Mary in a miraculous manner, Luke i. 35. 2. He is ſtiled Son of God upon account of his office, John x. 34. 3. Of his reſurrection,

reſurrection, Acts xiii. 33. and Rom. i. 4. 4. He is ſtiled Son of God, as being appointed heir of all things, and as a Son in his own houſe, Heb. iii. 6. But remarkable it is, that our Saviour is never expreſly ſtiled Son of God, when he is deſcribed as deriving his exiſtence from the Father, before he came into the world. Particularly, in the firſt chapter of St. John's Goſpel, wherein we have an account of the pre-exiſtent ſtate of Chriſt, and his incarnation, he is ſtiled the *only begotten of the Father*, with reſpect to his incarnation, ver. 14, 18. But as to his pre-exiſtence, he is deſcribed as the *word* exiſting *with God in the Beginning*, ver. 1, 2. Now by a careful examination of the ſeveral ſenſes, in which our Saviour is ſtiled Son of God, there is not one which has the leaſt relation to the point you have in view, namely, that Chriſt muſt derive the ſame nature from the Father, becauſe he is ſtiled his Son. As the true reaſon of the different ſenſes of Son of God is diſtinctly taken notice of in Scripture; it is impoſſible to conceive, that the ſacred writers ſhould take no notice of the moſt fundamental ſenſe of all; they never tell us, that Chriſt is ſtiled Son of God, upon account of his having the ſame nature, or eſſence, with the Father. Their ſilence upon a point deemed important, undeniably demonſtrates, that the Apoſtles never entertained any ſuch notion; neither did they require any ſuch belief of the firſt Chriſtians; and it lies upon you, as a ſincere Chriſtian, to ſhow what right Chriſtians had, who lived ſeveral hundred years after their days, to make that neceſſary to ſalvation, which Chriſt and his Apoſtles never made ſo.

Having thus overthrown what you build upon the character of the Son of God, I proceed to ex-

amine the remaining part of your obſervations upon this text. When the Jews charged our Saviour, with calling God his Father, in a peculiar manner, and making himſelf equal to God; they could not poſſibly mean to charge him with aſſuming to himſelf the character of the one ſupreme God, or indeed with being a God in any ſenſe (as neither they, nor his diſciples had as yet any ſuch notion), but that he claimed a power, or authority, like that of God, in ſetting aſide the reſt of the Sabbath, in caſes of mercy and charity, which reſt was eſtabliſhed upon the expreſs authority of God. Let our Saviour's reply to this accuſation of the Jews be carefully examined; and it will appear, that he diſclaims all power and authority in himſelf, and refers all his works to the honour of the Father who ſent him, from whom he profeſſes to have received all his powers; and, conſequently, upon ſuppoſition that the Jews took his words, as aſſuming to himſelf powers and privileges equal to thoſe of the Father, he has abſolutely denied the charge. The whole tenor of our Lord's diſcourſe upon this occaſion, demonſtrates his inferiority to his God and Father. Some of the more remarkable paſſages, are quoted in the Appeal, to which you have given no anſwer: only you refer to ver. 30. and 17. The reader will be ſurprized to find the former text, directly overthrowing the notion you contend for; *I can of mine own ſelf do nothing*; as *I hear*, I judge, and my judgment is juſt, becauſe I ſeek not *mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath ſent me.* Again, as to ver. 17. which you refer to, as ſhowing the communication of the Father's power to be eternal, *my Father worketh hitherto, and I work*, the words neither affirm nor imply any ſuch doctrine, but interpreted by

by the occaſion of this diſcourſe and context, may be thus explained: though God appointed the reſt on the Sabbath Day, in commemoration of his having created the heavens and the earth in ſix days, and ceaſed indeed on the ſeventh day, from his works of creation; yet he is now, and always has been employed in works of providence and goodneſs every day; and I likewiſe, in imitation of God, perform works of charity, even on the Sabbath Day (and the ſame thing may be juſtly applied in a lower ſenſe, to any good and charitable perſon). It is very ſtrange that you ſhould infer from hence, an eternal communication of power from the Father to the Son; and that the Son, to whom it is communicated, is of an eternal nature, perſonally ſubſiſting, and conſequently, of the ſame nature with the Father: I have already overthrown your inference drawn from the character of the Son of God, which is ſo far from implying any ſuch doctrine, as an eternal nature with the Father, that the direct contrary is manifeſtly intended by the ſacred writers. And as to any expreſs mention of an eternal nature derived from the Father, you cannot produce one word in this whole diſcourſe, that has the leaſt relation to ſuch an obſcure notion, and which indeed is abſolutely impoſſible in the nature of things. Our Saviour has profeſſed himſelf inferior to the Father, not leſs than fifteen times in this diſcourſe; which could not poſſibly have come from him, if he had intended to convey the notion of his being equal to the Father, as touching his Godhead.

John x. 18. xii. 49, 50. xiv. 31. xv. 10. I argued from theſe declarations of our Saviour, that he has profeſſed himſelf inferior to his God and Father, becauſe he received commandments

from him, it being unreaſonable to ſuppoſe that the ſupreme God ſhould be commanded by another perſon.

You obſerve, "that I take the term, God, abſolutely, and then apply what Chriſt ſays of himſelf, as the Son, to the one only God comprehending Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt." *Anſ.* As you ſo frequently have recourſe to this diſtinction, I need only remind you, that I have already effectually demoliſhed this groundleſs notion, on which your anſwer is founded; and challenge you to produce one paſſage in the New Teſtament, where the word, God, neceſſarily conveys the idea of three Perſons: and in the laſt article I have obſerved, that Chriſt always ſpeaks of himſelf as inferior, and never as ſupreme God.

With regard to John x. 18. you obſerve, "that *this commandment* does not ſo properly and naturally refer to the latter part of our Saviour's declaration, as the former." *Anſ.* Let it be ſo, though I think the contrary more probable; yet ſtill Chriſt profeſſes to have *received this commandment*, whatever it was, from the Father; and, conſequently, common ſenſe aſſures me, that he is inferior to the Father. The other texts quoted in the Appeal, wherein Chriſt is ſaid to be commanded by the Father, are left unanſwered, and you think it ſufficient to conclude, that an equal may be commanded, as well as ſent by an equal, as you have already ſhown. On the other ſide, I have plainly pointed out the difference between human and divine affairs, it being abſolutely impoſſible for the ſupreme God, to undergo any ſuch change as this ſtate implies. St. Paul has determined this point beyond a poſſibility of evaſion. Rom. xi. 35, 36. he thus expreſſes himſelf: *Who hath firſt given to him, namely, God,*

God, and it ſhall be recompenſed unto him again? For of him, and through him, and to him are all things. Theſe words ſtrongly declare, that the moſt high God, cannot poſſibly have any thing *given* him by the moſt exalted perſon whatſoever. When therefore our Lord affirms, as the Father *gave me commandment*, even ſo I do, he diſclaims, according to St. Paul's determination, all pretenſions to the character of ſupreme God, and ſolemnly aſcribes it to the Father, who, as ſupreme, gives commandments, which Chriſt obeys, as being inferior; that our ſins could not be redeemed, without an infinite price, not declared in Scripture. Mark xiii. 32. Matth. xxvii. 36. This declaration of our Saviour is ſo plain, clear, and ſtrong, and one would think, ſo impoſſible to be perverted by the art of man to any other than the natural ſenſe of the words, that it is one remarkable inſtance of learned men employing their ſkill, to darken and confound the moſt evident truths. It might be ſufficient to refer our common readers, to my obſervations in the Appeal, and compare them with your anſwer: but, I am determined to examine every particular, that I may give all poſſible ſatisfaction upon this important point.

We are agreed that this whole diſcourſe, of which this ſolemn declaration is a part, was occaſioned by our Saviour's pronouncing the utter deſtruction of the temple. But then you obſerve, "that there is no clear foundation for my poſitive aſſertion, that the final deſtruction of the world was intended, and that the context ſeems to intimate, that the particular day and hour, refer to that particular deſtruction only, namely, of the temple. From whence you infer, that our Saviour makes no ſuch diſtinction as I do for him, between the

the time of the deſtruction of the temple, as owning he knew that, and the time of the world as owning he knew not that; but if both intended blends his prophecy of both together."

Anſ. It appears by the whole diſcourſe of our Saviour, that part of it relates to the deſtruction of the city and temple of Jeruſalem, and part of it to his ſecond coming to judge the world; which contains an anſwer to the enquiries of the diſciples: *Tell us, when ſhall theſe things be? and what ſhall be the ſign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?* It is not neceſſary to go through all the particulars of this wonderful diſcourſe; it may be ſufficient to point out ſome ſtriking circumſtances. When our Lord mentions the abomination of deſolation, foretold by Daniel the Prophet, ſtanding where it ought not, (let him that readeth underſtand) then let them which be in Judea flee to the mountains, Matth. xxiv. 25. or Mark xiii. 14. Theſe things, and what we find in the following verſe, muſt neceſſarily be underſtood of the deſtruction of the temple, and city of Jeruſalem. Again, when Chriſt foretells that all the tribes of the earth ſhall mourn, and then they ſhall ſee the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory, and he ſhall ſend his Angels with a great ſound of a trumpet, and they ſhall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other, St. Matthew, ver. 30, 31. and St. Mark, ver. 26. We muſt interpret this of his ſecond coming in glorious majeſty to judge the quick and dead. When therefore, our Lord declares, ver. 30. of St. Mark, this generation ſhall not paſs, till all theſe things be fulfilled, we muſt naturally judge that all theſe things denote, all the particulars relating to the deſtruction

of

of the temple and city of Jeruſalem, with the miſeries of the Jewiſh people in conſequence of it. But when our Lord declares, ver. 32. immediately after: *But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no not the Angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father, or my Father only*; we muſt neceſſarily interpret theſe words of the end of the world: and conſequently the diſtinction I made, between the time of the deſtruction of the temple, and the end of the world, is founded upon the expreſs words of our Saviour. He aſſured his diſciples, that the former would happen in that very generation, but the time of the latter, none knew but the Father only.

You go on to obſerve, "that though our Saviour ſays in St. Mark expreſsly, not the Son, but the Father; yet in St. Matthew, which yet you take notice of, the Son is omitted, and inſtead of the Father, it is, my Father only. Now, according to a former diſtinction, neither nice, nor ſubtle, the expreſſion, the Father, taken ſimply and alone, denotes God, the Father of us all, different from that, the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, or, my Father, when Chriſt is the ſpeaker, whereby the particular diſtinct perſon of the Father of Chriſt is intended; who we are given to underſtand, is in a different manner the Father of our Lord, from that whereby God Almighty, which comprehends the three Perſons, and therefore applicable to any of them, is the Father of all his creatures. According to this diſtinction, our Saviour in St. Mark, confining this knowledge to God the almighty Father of the world, by no means excludes himſelf, who muſt be always included in the notion of Almighty God. For though the Son ſeems to be expreſsly mentioned in the

the excluſion; yet as he had not yet revealed his divine nature to the Apoſtles, he therefore ſpeaks to them agreeably to their preſent conceptions of him, while at the ſame time from the whole context, he gives them a clue, whereby they were enabled to conclude, as they afterwards did, John xvi. 30. xxi. 17. that *he knew all things*. Chriſt therefore in St. Mark, ſpeaks of himſelf, not as he really was, but as what his diſciples then apprehended him to be: while in St. Matthew, though the particular mention of himſelf is omitted; yet the excluſion extending to all creatures, he leaves them for that time, to apply it alſo to himſelf, according to their then conceptions of him: but when he afterwards gradually lays open to them his divine nature; they juſtly attribute to him all kind of knowledge without exception." Pages 25—27.

Anſ. As to the diſtinction, on which your ſolution depends, I have already taken notice of the infinite abſurdity of it. See page 18—22. I ſhall only add, that to make the expreſſion, *The Father*, ſignify Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, and *my Father*, the diſtinct perſon of the Father of Chriſt, muſt demonſtrate the great diſtreſs you are driven to; and muſt convince all unprejudiced perſons, that a cauſe muſt neceſſarily be falſe at bottom, which requires ſuch an interpretation of Scripture, as really deſtroys the uſe of language, perverts common ſenſe, and has a natural tendency to expoſe the ſacred writings to contempt and ridicule. By virtue of this groſs and palpably abſurd interpretation, you aſſume that the Son is not excluded from the knowledge of the day of judgment, becauſe he is always included in the notion of Almighty God, conſidered as the Father of his

his creatures. You muſt be often reminded, that you cannot produce one paſſage in the New Teſtament, where the word, God, neceſſarily conveys the idea of three Perſons. But let your abſurd ſuppoſition be admitted, that Chriſt is included in the term, Father, and conſequently knew the day of judgment; yet ſtill the grand difficulty remains, how to reconcile this knowledge with our Saviour's plain declaration, that the Son did not know it. Why, you are obliged to make our Saviour ſhuffle and prevaricate, like an artful politician, *he ſpeaks of himſelf not as he really was, but as what his diſciples then apprehended him to be.* In other terms, the Holy Jeſus denied what was true: if he knew the day of judgment in any capacity, it cannot be true that the Son did not know it. No poſſible reaſon can be aſſigned, why our Lord ſhould talk to his diſciples in ſuch an evaſive manner, when he might very eaſily have ſaid, though I know the exact time of the day of judgment, yet I do not think it proper to communicate the knowledge of it to you, agreeably to his method upon other occaſions: I have yet many things to ſay unto you, but ye cannot bear them now, John xvi. 12.

However though, according to your account, our Saviour adapted his diſcourſe to the notions of his diſciples, by denying what he really knew, yet afterwards, John xvi. 30.—xxi. 17. the Apoſtles are led to a right opinion concerning his divine nature, and profeſs that he knoweth *all things.* Let this caſe be impartially conſidered: our Lord plainly told his diſciples, that he did not know the day of judgment; his diſciples declare on the other hand, upon another occaſion, that he knoweth all things: from whence you argue that our Saviour muſt be ſuppoſed to know the day

of

of judgment, otherwiſe theſe declarations cannot be conſiſtent. At firſt view the advantage is on my ſide, it being more reaſonable to interpret a general declaration of the diſciples conſiſtently with our Saviour's own words, incapable of any other ſenſe without confounding the uſe of language; than to give an abſurd ſenſe to a plain declaration of Chriſt, in order to make it conſiſtent with a general expreſſion of the diſciples, interpreted with the utmoſt rigour, and which is eaſily capable of another ſenſe, if the context be compared. As to John xvi. 30. It was occaſioned by what our Saviour had ſaid, *a little while and ye ſhall not ſee me: and again, a little while and ye ſhall ſee me, becauſe I go to the Father*, ver. 16. The diſciples did not underſtand our Saviour's meaning, and ſo talked privately among themſelves about it, in ſuch a way that he ſhould not hear them, ver. 17, 18. Our Saviour therefore, who was acquainted with their thoughts, prevented any farther enquiries, by informing them plainly what they thought, ver. 19. In the verſes immediately following, he clearly explains his meaning. Upon which his diſciples ſaid unto him, *Lo, now ſpeakeſt thou plainly, now are we ſure that thou knoweſt* all things, *and needeſt not that any man ſhould aſk thee: by this we believe that thou cameſt forth from God*, ver. 29, 30. The *all things* therefore referred to in this declaration of the diſciples, were only the ſecret thoughts of their hearts; they could not poſſibly intend any more, and the words immediately following, neceſſarily confirm this ſenſe. Chriſt, according to their judgment, knew *all things*, becauſe he knew their private deſire to aſk him, and gave them readily a pertinent anſwer to their propoſed enquiry. There is therefore no reaſon to believe,

lieve, that the diſciples aſcribed univerſal knowledge to Chriſt by this confeſſion, but only an extenſive knowledge of ſuch things as were beyond the reach of ordinary men. It is not uncommon for the ſacred writers to uſe this expreſſion, namely, *knowing all things*, in a limitted ſenſe. Thus, not to repeat examples of this produced in the Appeal, p. 45. 2d edit. 2 Sam. xiv. 20. The wiſe woman ſaid to David, my Lord is wiſe according to the wiſdom of an Angel of God, to know *all things* that are in the earth. 2 Tim. ii. 7. St. Paul declares to Timothy, the Lord give thee underſtanding in *all things*. 1 John ii. 27. St. John ſays to the diſciples, the ſame anointing teacheth you of *all things*. Every perſon of common ſenſe, when he reads theſe general declarations, naturally judges that they were deſigned to expreſs only an extenſive knowledge. It is obſervable, that the diſciples had no ſooner declared: *Now are we ſure that thou knoweſt all things, and needeſt not that any man ſhould aſk thee*; but they immediately add, *by this we believe that thou cameſt forth from God*; which is an expreſſion implying that he was a true Prophet, as contradiſtinguiſhed from falſe Prophets, who are not ſent by God, but come of themſelves. I gather this from the words of Chriſt himſelf, John viii. 42. *I proceeded forth* (the ſame word which is here rendered, came forth), *and came from God*; *neither came I of myſelf, but he ſent me.* When therefore, his diſciples concluded that he proceeded forth from God, that is, was a true Prophet, becauſe he *knew all things*, it is very plain that they inferred nothing more from his extraordinary knowledge, than that he was a man who had received an extraordinary aſſiſtance of God's Holy Spirit, which was the caſe of Prophets.

As to St. Peter's declaration, John xxi. 17. Lord, thou *knoweſt all things*, thou knowſt that I love thee, the occaſion of it requires a limitted interpretation, which means no more than that Chriſt was acquainted with the thoughts of his heart, and ſo he might be well aſſured of his ſincere love and affection towards him. It is remarkable, that you have quoted a paſſage upon this very occaſion, wherein you contend that *all things* muſt not be interpreted in an univerſal ſenſe, John xv. 15 *All things which I have heard from my Father, I have made known to you.* I agree with you that our Saviour did not mean by this expreſſion, *all things* without exception, but only thoſe things which he heard from his Father, relative to the purpoſes of his miſſion. Doubtleſs, Chriſt knew many things which he did not think proper to communicate to his diſciples. But how does this conceſſion, remove the grand difficulty of our Saviour's ſolemnly profeſſing his ignorance of the day of judgment, about which he had been particularly aſked? Common ſenſe muſt convince every unprejudiced perſon, that if our Saviour had really known it, and had not thought it proper to communicate the knowledge of it to his diſciples, he moſt certainly would have plainly ſaid ſo.

Again, you obſerve that "if this interpretation, namely, that Chriſt knew the day of judgment, doth not take place, the whole context of each Evangeliſt neceſſarily involves a moſt palpable contradiction. For the day and hour mentioned by both, plainly means the coming of the Son of Man: but the Son of Man is repreſented as a man travelling into a far country; the uncertainty of whoſe return repreſents the uncertainty of Chriſt's coming: but it will not be ſaid, that be-

cauſe

becauſe the ſervants did not know the Maſter, or Lord of the Houſe, knew not alſo the time of his intended return; and, therefore, in the parallel caſe, Chriſt cannot be ſaid to be ignorant of the time of his own coming. If then none but God, the Father of Chriſt, knows this, here Chriſt is ſaid to know, and not to know the ſame thing at the ſame time." Page 28.

Anſ. If our Lord in one part of his diſcourſe, abſolutely denied his knowledge of the day of judgment, and directly affirmed it in another, it would be an expreſs contradiction, not conſiſtent with the character of our bleſſed Lord. But the caſe is far otherwiſe; in the verſes immediately following this remarkable declaration, our Saviour exhorts his diſciples to watch and pray, as not knowing the time of judgment, which he enforces by a parable of a man taking a far journey, who gave authority to his ſervants, and to every man his work, and commanded the porter to watch. With regard to the interpretation of parables, all judicious perſons muſt allow, that the general ſcope and deſign of them is chiefly to be conſidered; neither muſt we interpret every circumſtance of them in too ſtrict and literal a ſenſe. Now the evident deſign of our Lord is to exhort his diſciples to the duty of watchfulneſs, from the conſideration of the uncertainty of the time of Chriſt's coming to judgment. In the parable there is not one word ſaid about the Maſter of the Houſe, knowing the time of his return, or not, our Lord's view being to repreſent the duty of the ſervants, from the uncertainty of their maſter's return. But let the words be taken in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, which is more than we are obliged to grant; as our Lord had juſt mentioned his ignorance of the

exact time of his own coming, ſo a *man* taking a *far* journey, cannot be juſtly ſaid to *know* the preciſe day and hour of his return. There is therefore no ſort of contradiction in affirming, agreeably to our Lord's ſolemn Declaration, that God the Father was the only perſon who knew the day of judgment, and that our Saviour himſelf, whilſt he was upon earth, was ignorant of it; there being nothing ſaid in this diſcourſe, or any other part of the New Teſtament inconſiſtent with it; and, conſequently, Chriſt cannot be God in as high a ſenſe as the Father, he cannot be equal to him in all eſſential perfections, becauſe he was ignorant of ſomething which the Father knew. This is the concluſion which every unprejudiced perſon of common ſenſe muſt neceſſarily draw, when the evidence is fairly laid before him.

Matth. xxvi. 39, 42, 44; the whole 17th chapter of St. John's Goſpel; Luke xxii. 41, 42, 44; Matth. xxvii. 46; Luke xxiii. 34, 46; Luke vi. 12.—ix, 18, 28, 29.—xi. 1, 2; John xiv. 16; Heb. v. 7.

I earneſtly recommended to the conſideration of my chriſtian readers theſe paſſages of the New Teſtament, wherein our Saviour is repreſented as offering up prayers to his God and Father, and not only ſo, but likewiſe as praying with ſtrong crying and tears; which neceſſarily ſignifies a deep ſenſe of his own inſufficiency, and the abſolute neceſſity he was under, to offer up prayers to his God and Father. The argument ariſing from hence is clear and ſtrong: Chriſt, cannot poſſibly be God, in as high a ſenſe as the Father, becauſe he has ſolemnly profeſſed a deep ſenſe of his own dependence upon the Father, and want of ability

ability to perform what he thus prays for, with ſo much earneſtneſs and ſubmiſſion.

In anſwer to this you obſerve, "that the earneſt prayers which Chriſt offers up to his Father, are not ſo much the effect of his own real inſufficiency and inferiority to the Father, as of his voluntary and temporary diveſtment of his divine power and glory, during his purpoſed humiliation. For ſurely, he cannot be ſuppoſed upon any account to pray to his Father; but becauſe he for that time declined the exertion of his power, which he enjoyed in common with his Father, which he had with him before the world was, in order to carry on the great work, for which he was ſent. The tears and agonies therefore, which the author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews deſcribes, are by the very words, In the days of his fleſh, plainly intimated to be the tears and agony of his humanity, which being at that time entirely left to its feelings by the divinity, muſt naturally in ſuch circumſtances, utter expreſſions ſignificant of its own inſufficiency; and yet that inſufficiency be ſo far attributed to whole Chriſt; inaſmuch, as the divinity was at that time, purpoſely as it were, inactive; or if at all employed, guarding the human nature from any unworthy reſentment of the ſufferings it felt, and at the ſame time it heightened and enlarged the ſenſe of its ſufferings." Pages 28, 29.

Anſ. Here you take it for granted, that Chriſt enjoyed divine power and glory in common with the Father, that is, was God in as high a ſenſe as the Father. But ſtill the grand difficulty remains, how to account for Chriſt's praying to the Father, in a very ſubmiſſive manner for that which he was able to effect by his own power; which muſt be the caſe, if he enjoyed power in common with the

Father. You ſay, that Chriſt for that time declined the exertion of his power, and that the divinity was at that time purpoſely inactive. But ſurely, it ſeems very unaccountable and inconſiſtent with common ſenſe, that a perſon ſhould be able to help himſelf, and at the ſame time ſhould apply to another perſon in ſuch an earneſt and ſubmiſſive manner, as if he had really no ſuch power. What reaſon can be aſſigned, why our Saviour ſhould decline the exertion of a power, which, according to your notion, he was equally capable of with the Father? Why ſhould his humanity be left unſupported by his divinity, to which you ſuppoſe it joined, and make ſuch earneſt ſupplications to the Father, as if Chriſt had no ſuch ſupreme divinity as has been aſcribed to him? It is infinitely more reaſonable to believe, that our Saviour would never have prayed to his God and Father, in terms ſtrongly pointing out his own dependence and inſufficiency, if he had been equally powerful with the Father. This indeed appears ſo very ſtriking even to yourſelf, that you cannot help expreſſing the notion you are labouring to confound: you ſay, that the earneſt prayers which Chriſt offers up to his father, are not ſo much the effect of his own real inſufficiency and inferiority to the Father, as of his own voluntary diveſtment of his divine power and glory; which implies that they were in ſome meaſure occaſioned by his own real inſufficiency and inferiority to the Father. Again, you ſay that the humanity of Chriſt being left to its feelings by the divinity, muſt naturally in ſuch circumſtances, utter expreſſions ſignificant of its own inſufficiency, and yet that inſufficiency be ſo far attributed to whole Chriſt, in as much as the divinity was at that time unactive. Now our Saviour's in-

ſufficiency

ſufficiency and abſolute dependence upon his God and Father, are as ſtrongly expreſſed as it is poſſible for words to do it: but the misfortune of your ſcheme is, that there is not one word ſaid about any part of Chriſt being exempted from this dependent ſtate, not the leaſt hint of the divinity being unactive; the whole perſon of Chriſt is plainly repreſented as offering up ſupplications and prayers, with ſtrong crying and tears unto his God and Father; and therefore common ſenſe clearly determines, that the whole perſon of Chriſt is inferior to the one ſupreme God and Father of all.

But you proceed to make another uſe of this prayer of our Saviour, referred to by St. Paul in his Epiſtle to the Hebrews, namely, to obviate my objection againſt the perfect knowledge of Chriſt. "For Chriſt was perfectly acquainted with the certainty of his death, and yet prayed againſt it. If he then conſiſtent with his own certain knowledge, prayed againſt the completion of an unavoidable event, as a thing to be avoided; why might he not, conſiſtent with his infinite knowledge, not yet confeſſed or underſtood by his enquirers, deny as man, while they took him to be no more, what he certainly knew, and afterwards convinced them of, as God?" Page 30.

Anſ. That our Saviour was fully aſſured he ſhould die, I fairly allow; and that he prayed againſt his death when he ſaw it approaching, is no leſs certain; but you ſhould have added, with perfect reſignation to his Father's will: *Neverthleſs not my will, but thine be done.* The expreſſions of the Evangeliſts relating to our Saviour's agony and paſſion before, and at his death, point out a more diſtreſsful ſtate than ever was experienced by common mortals; and many conjectures have been

formed to account for this diſmal ſcene. It is probably ſuppoſed, that as Chriſt was in all things made like unto his brethren; ſo he muſt have been obnoxious to the uſual infirmities and temptations of human nature, which might be increaſed by reflections on the ill ſucceſs of his miniſtry, the ingratitude of the Jews, and poſſibly his imagination at that time might be terrified by evil miniſters: all which ſufficiently account for his earneſt ſupplications to his father, *to remove, if poſſible, that bitter cup from him*; this being exactly agreeable to the common infirmity of human nature, to which, as we are expreſsly aſſured, our Saviour was ſubject, though he knew this bitter ſcene was appointed for him. But then the obedience of Chriſt, and reſignation to his Father's will appear much brighter, in proportion to the extraordinary terrors with which he was afflicted. The caſe is clearly repreſented in the words of Chriſt himſelf: *Now is my ſoul troubled; and what ſhall I ſay? Father, ſave me from this hour*: this is the infirmity of a man; and in the next words this infirmity is corrected: *but for this cauſe came I unto this hour*: by which he profeſſed his reſolution to ſubmit, notwithſtanding the certain proſpect of the greateſt ſufferings he could endure. Now, what relation has this behaviour of our Saviour, to a ſolemn declaration of his ignorance of the day of judgment, about which he had been particularly aſked? There is no ſort of likeneſs in the two caſes, to found a parallel upon. Our Saviour by praying againſt terrible evils when he ſaw them near at hand, but ſtill with reſignation to his Father's will, acted agreeably to the common principles of human nature: but he could not, conſiſtently with ſincerity, deny what he knew, when he was particularly

ticularly aſked; beſides, the enquirers as being his immediate dependents, might have been eaſily put off by ſhowing the impropriety of their being informed, without profeſſing an abſolute ignorance.

John xiv. 28. To which may be added, John x. 29. In order to qualify theſe plain and ſtrong declarations of our bleſſed Saviour, you have recourſe to the old diſtinction, that Chriſt is inferior to the Father, as he is the Father, but equal to him as he is God, he being one God equally with him. Nothing can ſhew the falſhood of the Athanaſian doctrine in a ſtronger light, than the defence you are obliged to make. That Chriſt ſhould be one God equally with the Father, that is, ſhould be equally ſupreme, and at the ſame time ſhould be inferior to the Father, is as expreſs a contradiction as can be ſet forth in words. The declarations of our Saviour are incapable of any other ſenſe, than that the Father is greater than Chriſt, and all other perſons, in every reſpect and capacity: *I* muſt neceſſarily ſignify our Saviour's whole perſon; whatever natures you ſuppoſe united in Chriſt, *I* includes them all. But on the other ſide, the diſtinction by which you endeavour to evade theſe unanſwerable declarations, is not found in Scripture, but is a pure invention of the learned, to ſolve plain expreſſions of Scripture, expreſsly contrary to their determination.

And thus, I think, I have plainly proved that, notwithſtanding all your laboured defence, our Lord's own declarations do effectually demoliſh the Athanaſian doctrine. I would juſt remind you, that I quoted ſeveral other texts, page 22. 2d. edit. as ſtrongly expreſſing the ſame doctrine, namely, Chriſt's inferiority to his God and Father, to which I find no particular anſwer. However you con-

clude, that " the declarations of our Lord, when duly compared and conſidered, do fully authorize the doctrine of our Church ; which with proper care and attention is as obvious to the poor, the mean, and unlearned, in the tranſlation before them, as to the wiſe and learned." I fully agree with you, that you have gained your cauſe, provided the Athanaſian Creed, be eſteemed as the grand rule of religious faith ; provided that diſtinctions be admitted, to which Chriſt and his Apoſtles were abſolute ſtrangers ; and provided that words and expreſſions, be allowed to ſignify ſomething directly contrary to their natural ſenſe. But let Scripture, our only rule of Chriſtian faith and practice, be interpreted by common ſenſe, and the doctrine you contend for is gone for ever. Be pleaſed to take notice, that you have blamed me for appealing to the common ſenſe of unlearned Chriſtians, and yet your words which I have juſt cited, neceſſarily imply, that they are competent judges. Sure I am, that all Chriſtian people would readily give up the Athanaſian Creed and worſhip, if they had an opportunity of ſeeing the evidence fairly and honeſtly laid before them.

The declarations of the Apoſtles are next to be conſidered.

Acts ii. 32. From this text I argued, that Chriſt muſt be a perſon inferior to God, who raiſed him from the dead.

You anſwer thus : " Here again you take the term, God, abſolutely ; whereas it evidently means the perſon of God the Father : for David in his prophetic declarations concerning the Meſſiah, cited here by this Apoſtle, expreſsly ſays, *The Lord ſaid to my Lord*, &c. thereby making the Son as much his Lord as the Father ; as our Saviour's

our's putting the caſe to the Phariſees, Matth. xxii. 42, 43. plainly ſhews; and by giving them both equally the character of Lord, as he elſewhere doth that of God, he ſhews them both to be equally Lord and God. For though the expreſſion, *thy God*, Pſalm xlv. 8. makes the Father to be the God of Chriſt; yet it doth not this, becauſe he is underſtood as God excluſively; but as being the Father of God the Son, conſidered here as man; as the following expreſſion, *above thy fellows*, clearly intimates. For otherwiſe, the Prophets calling the Father God, and the Son God alſo, would be eſtabliſhing not ſo much two perſons, as two diſtinct Gods, contrary to the expreſs doctrine both of reaſon and Scripture. The Father of Chriſt therefore, being the perſon here intended by the appellation of God; it by no means precludes the operating power of the Son, in raiſing up the man Jeſus, or re-uniting his human ſoul to his human body, agreeable to the commandment which he had received from his Father, as we have before properly explained it." Pages 31, 32.

Anſ. You perpetually take it for gaanted, that the term, God, taken abſolutely, ſignifies Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, which I have effectually overthrown. The truth is, when the term, God, is uſed in Scripture abſolutely, and by way of eminence, the perſon of the Father is always meant, of which the text now conſidered, and ſeveral hundred others of the like ſort, are a manifeſt proof. When, therefore, you contend that the term, God, in this text, means the perſon of the Father: I agree with you, it undoubtedly does ſo, it cannot poſſibly have any other ſignification. But with reſpect to what you immediately add, you draw a concluſion, in expreſs contradiction to the plain

plain ſenſe of the words you have quoted. *The Lord*, namely, JEHOVAH, *ſaid to my Lord*, ADON, namely, CHRIST, *ſit thou on my right hand, until I make thy foes thy footſtool.* Here the Father has the title of Jehovah, in contradiſtinction to Chriſt, who is ſtiled Adon, or an inferior Lord, and by his expreſs authority grants him the extraordinary favour of ſitting at his right hand, till he, namely, God the Father had ſubdued all his enemies; and yet you maintain in oppoſition to the light of common ſenſe, that Chriſt is *equally Lord* with the *ſupreme Jehovah*, from whom he is expreſsly ſaid to *derive* all his power and authority, and from whom he is diſtinguiſhed in the original Hebrew by an inferior title. Add to this, that in the verſe preceding the citation of the Apoſtle, Chriſt is repreſented as being by the right hand of God *exalted*, and having *received* of the Father the promiſe of the Holy Ghoſt, ver. 33. as to the title of God, that ſhall be conſidered in another place.

With regard to your laſt obſervation, whatever power Chriſt may be ſuppoſed to have, in the act of the reſurrection, it is expreſly attributed to the Father, from whom he received all his power; and you yourſelf cannot help acknowledging his inferiority, at the very time you are labouring to eſtabliſh an equality: for ſurely, Chriſt by *receiving a commandment* from the Father, muſt be inferior to the Father. Your way of talking of the Son in raiſing up the man Jeſus, re-uniting his human ſoul to his human body, is groſs confuſion, as it neceſſarily makes Chriſt two perſons; which abſurdity ſhall be conſidered in the progreſs of the debate.

Acts ii. 36. The argument ariſing from theſe words, is plain and unanſwerable: *God* hath *made*

Jeſus

Jeſus both *Lord* and *Chriſt*, and conſequently Jeſus is a perſon inferior to God, or the Father, who *made* him what he was.

The ſubſtance of your firſt obſervation is to this effect: "The divinity of Chriſt and his union with the Father, are pointed out in this diſcourſe of St. Peter, becauſe it was foretold by the Prophet Joel, that God would pour out his Spirit upon all fleſh, and it appears, that Chriſt was the perſon who ſhed forth this wonderful gift: as therefore, Chriſt performs what God promiſed he would do, the divinity of Chriſt and his union with the Father, may be juſtly inferred." Pages 32, 33.

Anſ. Nothing can be more fallacious than this way of arguing; God may be properly ſaid to do what he performs by an inferior inſtrument. This is exactly agreeable to Scripture in numberleſs inſtances; and particularly in this very diſcourſe; God is repreſented by the Prophet Joel, as ſhewing ſigns in the earth beneath: now this prophecy was fulfilled by our Saviour's performing miracles and wonders, according to the determination of St. Peter, which he has expreſſed with the greateſt accuracy, ver. 22. Ye men of Iſrael, hear theſe words; *Jeſus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, by miracles, and wonders, and ſigns, which God did by him.* Here Chriſt is expreſsly declared to be an inferior inſtrument whom God employed in working miracles; and God is ſaid to do what he performs by, or through Chriſt. In like manner, God foretells by the Prophet Joel, that he will pour out of his Spirit, which was fulfilled by Chriſt being *exalted* by the right hand of God, and having *received* of the Father the promiſe of the Holy Ghoſt, and ſhedding forth this wonderful gift. ver. 33. Here Chriſt is plainly, and

and ſtrongly declared to be an inferior perſon, whom God employed in diſpenſing the gifts of the Holy Ghoſt. As Chriſt was *exalted* by God, and *received* from God, or the Father, this wonderful power, God may be ſaid with the utmoſt propriety by the Prophet Joel, to pour out of his Spirit, becauſe he made Chriſt the immediate diſpenſer of it.

Your next obſervation is this: "From all which, namely, St. Peter's whole diſcourſe, the Apoſtle would have his hearers with himſelf conclude, that this ſame Jeſus whom they crucified, God hath made both Lord and Chriſt; that is, *made it manifeſtly appear*, by the completion of theſe propheſies, at this time, and in this perſon, that this ſame Jeſus is both the Lord and Chriſt deſigned, and pointed out by David" Page 33.

Anſ. Your new explication of the word *made*, plainly ſhews the terrible diſtreſs you labour under, to ſay ſomething to an argument that cannot be evaded by the art of man. The whole purpoſe of St. Peter's diſcourſe was to prove, that Jeſus *was made* Lord and Chriſt, by God, or the Father. You do not pretend to give a direct anſwer to the obſervations, I deduced in the Appeal, p. 25. 2d edit. from this remarkable text, by which you confeſs them juſtly drawn, if the term *made* be taken in its uſual ſenſe; and therefore, your only refuge is, to alter the ſignification of the term: you cannot produce one paſſage in the New Teſtament, where the word (ποιεω), ſignifies to *make it manifeſtly appear*: if this had been the Apoſtle's meaning, he would have ſaid (εφανερωσε), manifeſted. You do not offer the leaſt tittle of evidence, to prove the ſenſe you have fixed upon the word *made*. The word in the New Teſtament ſignifies to do, or

or perform, to produce, make, or appoint, but it never denotes *to make it manifeſtly appear*. It is obſervable, that Chriſt is deſcribed as inferior to the Father, no leſs than ten times in this very diſcourſe: namely, Jeſus, a *man approved* (in Greek, *ſet forth*) of God —— ſigns which God *by him*, namely, Chriſt —— *Him being delivered* by the —— Foreknowledge of God — ye have *taken* — *and ſlain* — *whom God hath raiſed up* —— *God* — *would raiſe up Chriſt* —— *This Jeſus hath God raiſed up*. —— Being by the right hand of God *exalted*, and having *received of the Father* the promiſe of the Holy Ghoſt. —— The *Lord* (Jehovah), ſaid to my *Lord* (Adon) *ſit thou* on my right hand, until *I make* thy foes thy footſtool. —— God hath *made* that ſame Jeſus *Lord and Chriſt*.

You are obliged to grant, that God in all theſe paſſages means the perſon of the Father, as diſtinguiſhed from Chriſt and the Holy Spirit. But you obſerve, that I from thence as unjuſtly infer that "the appellation *God*, never ſignifies Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, but the Father only. For certainly the addreſs, *O God*, &c. Pſal. xlv. 7. and as it is applied by the author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, is to the Son, and not to the Father; as alſo, that of St. Thomas: and therefore, that term doth not always ſignify the Father."

Anſ. You have miſrepreſented my ſenſe with reſpect to my words, *Father only*, it being evident that I was ſpeaking of this very diſcourſe, wherein the term, God, in every paſſage where it occurs, undoubtedly means the Father, according to your own conceſſion. But I had no intention to deny, that Chriſt is ſtiled God, or a God, in ſome few paſſages of the New Teſtament. As to the term, God, ſignifying Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, I challenge

challenge you to produce one text, that neceſſarily conveys any ſuch notion. If you had known any one text, where the word God, denotes three Perſons, it was your immediate buſineſs to produce it, as you charge me with injuſtice for aſſerting the contrary.

Your next obſervation is, that "it is more than probable, that the term, God, doth not in this chapter, always ſignify the Father. For St. Peter, exhorts the Jews to be baptized in the name of Jeſus Chriſt. But the original inſtitution, was in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt. And therefore, Baptiſm, in the name of one only, if otherwiſe in every reſpect diſtinct from the reſt, inſufficient: the meaning therefore of the Apoſtle muſt be, that as the three Perſons are comprehended in the one God, and the name of God applied to any one of them, doth alſo extend to the other two; Baptiſm, in the name of any one of them, implying alſo in the name of the one God, doth conſequently imply in the name of the three Perſons." Page 34.

Anſ. This way of interpreting Scripture, ſcarce deſerves a ſerious anſwer: that the name of Chriſt ſhould imply the one God, and that the one God ſhould imply Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, is a groſs perverſion of Scripture language and ſentiment; the one God being conſtantly repreſented, as diſtinguiſhed from Chriſt and the Holy Spirit, and expreſsly determined to be the Father: the title of one God is never applied to Chriſt, or the Holy Spirit. The ſtate of the caſe is this: our Saviour gave expreſs orders that all nations, that is, men of all countries, who were converted to Chriſtianity, ſhould be baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt;

Ghoſt; which being of the ſame import with what is more briefly called profeſſing themſelves Chriſtians, or diſciples of Chriſt, they are therefore in this paſſage, and ſome others ſpoken of in a ſummary way, as being baptized into the name of the Lord Jeſus. And probably, St. Peter, mentioned the name of the Lord Jeſus only, becauſe his diſcourſe was directed to Jews, who already believed in God the Father; and as he at the ſame time gave them a promiſe of the gift of the Holy Ghoſt, this implies their being baptized into his name.

You go on to offer reaſons, why the Lord our God, ver. 39. means the perſon of Chriſt. "I. Becauſe the promiſe is not confined to the Jews only, but extended to the Gentiles, by which the Apoſtle intends a new character, not the God of Iſrael, but the God of the new Covenant. II. This God is deſigned by the name of the Lord, the name which the Apoſtle had but juſt proved to be the name of the Meſſiah. III. He is called by the Apoſtle not your God, though he is ſpeaking to the Jews, but our God, the God of us, his Apoſtles and Diſciples, who have embraced the faith of Chriſt, agreeable to that deſcription of Chriſt, where it is ſaid, they ſhall call his name *Emanuel*, that is, God with us." Page 34, 35.

Anſ. The title of the Lord our God, never ſignifies Chriſt in one clear and undoubted paſſage; but, according to the uniform ſenſe of the ſacred writers, it always denotes the perſon of the Father. As to the context, it ſeems highly unreaſonable to ſuppoſe, that St. Peter ſhould apply the title of the Lord our God to Chriſt, whom he had expreſsly diſtinguiſhed from God, ſo frequently in the foregoing diſcourſe, and to whom he had in the moſt ſolemn manner, declared Chriſt to be inferior.

ferior. And then with regard to the Jews, to whom the diſcourſe was directed, it is impoſſible to imagine, that they ſhould underſtand the Lord our God, of Chriſt. If they had entertained any ſuch notion, inſtead of giving St. Peter a patient hearing, and being converted to the faith of Chriſt, they would infallibly have cried out with loud voices, a Blaſphemer, and probably would have proceeded to the utmoſt violence.

But to give a direct anſwer to your reaſons. As to the firſt, certain it is, that God originally intended the favour of the Goſpel for Gentiles as well as Jews; but at the ſame time it is as certain, that St. Peter, notwithſtanding the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt, underſtood it not, as undeniably appears from Acts x. The Apoſtle's own words, ſeem to confine the promiſe to the Jews only; neither is this ſenſe contradicted by the expreſſion, *to all that are afar off*, it being well known, that the Jews were diſperſed through many diſtant countries. It is carefully to be obſerved, by the whole tenor of the Apoſtle's diſcourſes and writings, that the ſame perſon is conſtantly repreſented as the God of Iſrael, and the God of the new Covenant.

With reſpect to the ſecond reaſon, it is true, that this God is deſigned by the name of the Lord, and likewiſe it is true, that the Apoſtle had juſt given the title of Lord to the Meſſiah. The very words of St. Peter, to which you refer, directly overthrow your notion. *God hath made that Jeſus whom ye have crucified, Lord and Chriſt.* Add to this, that God and Chriſt have each the title of Lord in this diſcourſe. *The Lord* (Jehovah), *ſaid to my Lord* (Adon), namely, Chriſt. Undoubtedly, we muſt acknowledge Chriſt to be Lord but

but inferior to the one ſupreme Lord, who made him what he was; and whether we regard the profeſſed principles of the ſpeaker, or the hearers, it is infinitely abſurd to imagine, that St. Peter ſhould deſcribe Chriſt by the title of, Lord our God, immediately after ſuch a plain and ſolemn determination.

As to the laſt reaſon, it is not at all probable that St. Peter, in a diſcourſe delivered to Jews, ſhould ſtile God, Lord our God, as being in a peculiar ſenſe, the God of the Apoſtles and Diſciples, in diſtinction from the Jews, it being more adapted to his purpoſe to give them to underſtand, for whoſe converſion he was ſollicitous, that the ſame perſon is the God of Jews as well as Chriſtians; and therefore he might be juſtly called, in a diſcourſe delivered to Jews, by a Jewiſh Chriſtian, the Lord our God. This ſenſe is undeniably eſtabliſhed, by another diſcourſe of the ſame Apoſtle delivered to the Jews, Acts iii. 13. *The God of Abraham, and of Iſaac, and of Jacob, the God of our Fathers, hath glorified his Son Jeſus.* Here the God of the Jews, is expreſsly determined to be the God of Chriſtians, and at the ſame time he is plainly diſtinguiſhed from his Son Jeſus. *The Lord our God, and the God of our Fathers*, are expreſſions exactly parallel, and demonſtratively point out the ſame perſon, the one ſupreme God and Father of all, the original author of the Jewiſh and Chriſtian diſpenſations, as diſtinguiſhed from Jeſus. It may be proper to add, the ſolemn prayer addreſſed to God by the aſſembly of Chriſtians, Acts iv. 24, 29, 30. *Lord, thou art God, who haſt made heaven and earth —— Grant unto thy ſervants — that wonders and ſigns may be done by the name of thy holy Child Jeſus.* Here the Lord God is expreſsly

diſtinguiſhed from Chriſt. As for that text you quote from St. Matthew, *they ſhall call his name* Emanuel, *that is, God with us*; if meant of the Son, which is not abſolutely certain, it only proves that he ſhall have the title of God, and ſhall dwell with us; and remarkable it is, that this title is given to Chriſt in ſuch a way, as plainly ſhews it to be in the inferior ſenſe, which ſhall be more particularly proved in its proper place.

Again, you obſerve that Chriſt ſeems to be called Lord our God, by St. Peter, not only in conformity to the 45th Pſalm, but likewiſe to Iſaiah xxv. 9. xl. 3, 9. liv. 5. in the laſt of which the Evangelical Prophet doth not only inſiſt upon the ſame allegorical repreſentation; but alſo ſpecifies the Huſband to be the Maker of his Spouſe, the Church; her Redeemer, the Holy One of Iſrael, the God of all the earth; and expreſsly declares, that the Lord of Hoſts is his name. Now if we add to this, that the marriage of the Lamb, the Bridegroom of the new Jeruſalem, in the Revelations, is a plain alluſion hereto; it not only confirms what we have here obſerved; but makes it highly probable that this expreſſion of the Apoſtle, the Lord our God, means in this place another perſon, beſides the Father, in a way both eaſy and obvious to be underſtood: eſpecially, if we further conſider, that theſe prophecies can be ſaid in no ſort to be compleated, if we do not interpret this, and other ſuch like paſſages, in the ſame manner, where the context ſo fairly admits it.

Anſ. It is very certain, that the terms our God or Lord, the Lord our God, your God, the Lord of Hoſts, thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Iſrael, the God of all the earth referred to in Iſaiah, neceſſarily

ceſſarily ſignify the one ſupreme God and Father of all, according to the uniform ſenſe of the ſacred writers, and particularly of the prophet Iſaiah. And as you lay the greateſt ſtreſs upon chap. liv. 5. nothing can be more evident to an attentive reader of this chapter, than that the perſon ſtiled the Lord of Hoſts, thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Iſrael, *&c.* ver. 5. is the ſame perſon who is ſtiled Lord, ver. 13. Now the Lord, ver. 13. is determined to be the Father by the expreſs authority of our Saviour who refers to this very paſſage, John vi. 45. *It is written in the prophets, and they ſhall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me.* Beſides, in the preceding chapter, the Lord, namely, Jehovah, is diſtinguiſhed in a ſolemn manner from our Saviour Chriſt, chap. liii. 6. The *Lord* hath laid on *him*, namely, Chriſt, the iniquity of us all, ver. 10. It pleaſed the *Lord* to bruiſe *him*——the pleaſure of the *Lord* ſhall proſper in *his* hand.

The argument you would form from God's being repreſented under the notion of an Huſband is this: Iſaiah ſpeaks of the Lord God as the Huſband or Bridegroom of his church: now in the Revelation we have the marriage of the Lamb ſet forth, who is the Bridegroom of the new Jeruſalem in a plain alluſion to this allegorical repreſentation; therefore you would infer that the Lamb is the Lord God, or the Lord our God, or included in the notion of the Lord God.

Anſ. As God is ſometimes repreſented the Huſband of the Jewiſh people in the prophetic writings, when they adhere to his worſhip in oppoſition to all idolatry, which is deſcribed under the character of ſpiritual fornication; ſo in this chap-

ter God is conſidered as the Huſband of the Gentiles, when they ſhould make a very conſiderable part of the chriſtian church. In like manner, as God has appointed Chriſt the head of the church, the church is elegantly ſaid to be married to Chriſt. In alluſion to this notion idolatry is frequently ſtiled ſpiritual fornication. The Jews in the Old Teſtament, by revolting from the worſhip of the one God, were guilty of ſpiritual Fornication, as a wife, who proves an adultereſs, is falſe to her huſband. In the New Teſtament, chriſtian profeſſors are not only liable to ſpiritual fornication by departing from the worſhip of the one God, but likewiſe by ſetting up idol mediators whom God hath not appointed. But how does it follow from ſuch ſimilar alluſions, that the Lord God and the Lamb are one being? The ſame allegorical repreſentation may with the utmoſt propriety be applied to God in the Old Teſtament, and to Chriſt in the New, as God hath made Jeſus Lord and Head of the church, to which he bears a very near relation by having taken our nature upon him, and having redeemed us to God by his blood. Remarkable it is, that the Lamb in the book of Revelation is carefully diſtinguiſhed from the Lord God; and to imagine that the Lamb is included in the notion of Almighty God, muſt introduce the utmoſt confuſion, as will eaſily appear to any one who will examine all the paſſages, where God and the Lamb are mentioned. As to your obſervation, that theſe prophecies can be ſaid in no ſort to be compleated, unleſs interpreted in the manner you contend for; it may be juſtly anſwered, that 'tis very common in ſcripture expreſſion to foretell that God himſelf will be, or do, what in the event he has made his ſon, or does by him, or, indeed, what

what he does by any other inferior inſtrument: this is the ſtile which runs thro' every part of ſcripture. And in all good authors, 'tis uſual for the ſame thing to be applied to the principal perſon, and the inferior inſtrument employed in any tranſaction.

As you have quoted the 40th chapter of Iſaiah, I will form an argument from thence, which abſolutely deſtroys the notion you maintain, namely, the equality of Chriſt with the one ſupreme God. The prophet is deſcribing the wiſdom of the almighty Creator, ver. 14. who thus expreſſes it: *With whom took he counſel, and who inſtructed him, and taught him knowledge, and ſhewed him the way of underſtanding?* Theſe words ſtrongly declare that God the all-wiſe Governor of the world cannot poſſibly be *taught*, or *inſtructed* by the moſt exalted perſon in the univerſe. Now Chriſt expreſly declares of himſelf, John viii. 28. *As my Father hath taught me, I ſpeak theſe things*; and, therefore, according to the prophet's argument, Chriſt cannot be God in as high a ſenſe as the Father, he muſt neceſſarily be a perſon inferior to the Father, by whom he was *taught*.

You diſmiſs my remarks upon the reſt of St. Peter's and St. Paul's diſcourſes, as produced out of the Acts, with this obſervation, that I take the term *God*, *abſolutely and excluſively*, which fallacy has been already detected.

Anſ. 'Tis proper to remind you, that the term *God*, when uſed abſolutely, always means the perſon of the Father; and in the diſcourſes referred to, it undeniably ſignifies the Father, as diſtinguiſhed from Chriſt and the Holy Spirit, according to your own rule of interpreting ſcripture, p. 17, 18. As to the diſtinction intended by the

term *exclusively*, I have shewn the absurdity of it above. See p. 55—59.

However you think fit to consider what I have said in relation to Acts xvii. namely, that St. Paul calls Christ *the man whom God ordained.* This plain and admirable discourse of St. Paul delivered upon a solemn occasion, wherein he professes to set forth the true notion of Almighty God, is so evidently inconsistent with the doctrine you maintain, that you are forced to own it, and endeavour to evade the acknowledgment by a supposition, that St. Paul had not time and opportunity to explain the whole christian doctrine.

Ans Manifest it is, that St. Paul has plainly and sufficiently explained the general principles of christianity, and, more particularly, that grand point, for which I quoted this glorious speech, namely, the right opinion concerning Almighty God, which makes the greater part of his discourse, namely, from ver. 23. to ver. 31. From this we may learn that Almighty God is the Creator of heaven and earth; that he is our constant preserver and benefactor; that he is a Being of boundless mercy and compassion to his creatures; and that he will judge the world in righteousness: from whence the apostle very justly deduces the infinite folly of idolatry, instead of worshipping this great and good Creator, in whom (or through whom) we live, move and have our being. But I must beg leave to ask, why St. Paul, when he was professedly explaining the true notion of God, should absolutely omit the famous doctrine of three persons and one God. What! not the least hint of a doctrine that has been esteemed a fundamental article of the christian faith? Nay, almost every part of this speech is absolutely inconsistent with the

the Athanaſian doctrine. Admitting the ſuppoſition, that St. Paul has not delivered the whole chriſtian faith concerning Chriſt, yet he has certainly compleated what he had to ſay concerning God; and impoſſible it is for the moſt ſagacious Athanaſian to ſee in this diſcourſe three perſons and one God; even you who have ſhewn ſo much invention in deducing this doctrine all poſſible ways, do not ſo much as profeſs it; you have fairly given up St. Paul at a time, when he was obliged by duty as an apoſtle, to ſet forth the right opinion concerning the grand object of religious worſhip. As certain as St. Paul was an inſpired apoſtle, ſo certain is it that the Athanaſian doctrine of three perſons and one God is falſe and antichriſtian, and owes all its ſupport to the invention and authority of man. But admitting the ſuppoſition, that St. Paul was interrupted from delivering the whole chriſtian faith relating to the perſon of Chriſt, ought not the remaining part, if neceſſary to the ſalvation of chriſtians, to have been inſerted in the Acts of the apoſtles, which was wrote on purpoſe to inſtruct chriſtians what doctrines the apoſtles preached to Jews and Heathens; and what were the terms required to entitle converts to the glorious privileges of the Goſpel covenant? We have it plainly ſet forth in this excellent book, what profeſſion of faith was required of Jewiſh and heathen converts; which indeed contains but a very ſmall portion of eccleſiaſtical faith, as it was ſettled by fallible, contentious, and intereſted eccleſiaſtics many hundred years after the days of the apoſtles.

After having allowed that I have juſtly obſerved the different manner, in which the apoſtles addreſs their different kinds of hearers, you obſerve, "that

with regard to the Jews, it was neceſſary to ſhew them that the prophecies concerning the Meſſiah fully and clearly declare him to be of a divine nature; and, conſequently, of the ſame nature with him whom they believed to be their God: that he was begotten of the Father, who upon that account is ſuperior to him and his God: but as they are otherwiſe deſcribed under the ſame name and with the ſame attributes, and expreſly revealed to be one, and conſequently of the ſame nature; which the apoſtles do more than intimate by applying the deſcriptions of the one God in the Old Teſtament to Chriſt in the New; ſo the Jews are thereby taught to believe theſe two perſons to be equally the one God. In the next place you ſhould have told your readers, as to the Gentiles who knew not God, that it was neceſſary firſt to inform them rightly as to that point; and then from the reprobate ſtate in which they were, to ſhew the neceſſity of a Redeemer, who from the nature of their ſins and the conſequent ſatisfaction required by God, muſt appear to be of ſuch an infinite and invaluable nature, as neither death, nor the grave could compaſs, or retain. 'Tis reaſonable to believe that under each of theſe heads, the apoſtles enlarged upon all the particulars requiſite to compleat the doctrine of Chriſt." p. 37, 38.

Anſ. I have already overthrown what you offer relating to the Meſſiah as preached to the Jews, and likewiſe your notion of the Son's having the ſame nature with the Father. See above, p. 14, —16, &c. 'Tis a particular ſatisfaction upon a review to find, that the crime of omiſſion, with which you charge me, muſt fall upon the apoſtles themſelves; for evident it is from an impartial

view

view of all the diſcourſes recorded in the Acts of the apoſtles, that they have abſolutely omitted the doctrine you contend for, and you are obliged to ſuppoſe that they preached it, tho' no account of it appears. As to the Gentiles, your firſt obſervation is certainly right, that it was neceſſary to inform them as being ignorant, of the nature of God. Now St. Paul has done this in the plaineſt and moſt convincing manner, as I particularly obſerved in the Appeal. The deſcription that this eminent apoſtle has given of the one true God, is abſolutely inconſiſtent with your doctrine; not the leaſt diſtant intimation about Trinity in Unity, three Perſons and one God, can be found in St. Paul's diſcourſes, when he is profeſſedly explaining the true character of God. This is a deciſive fact, of which common chriſtians may be as good judges as the learned, if they employ their attention upon this ſubject. And as to that theological opinion of God's juſtice requiring an infinite ſatisfaction for the ſins of men, 'tis a doctrine not only contrary to God's moral attributes, but has not the leaſt foundation in ſcripture. I refer you to Dr. Sykes's ſcripture doctrine of the redemption of man by Chriſt, where this important point is ſet in a clear and rational light. You are obliged to grant, that the apoſtles in their diſcourſes have ſaid nothing about Chriſt's infinite ſatisfaction; but then you ſuppoſe that they enlarged upon ſuch particulars as were neceſſary to complete the chriſtian doctrine, that is, the ſyſtem of eccleſiaſtical faith, framed by men ſeveral hundred years after the days of the apoſtles.

On the other hand, give me leave to make a ſuppoſition that naturally ariſes from the apoſtle's manner of preaching to Jews and Gentiles. If

you,

you, or any other zealous Athanaſian, ſhould be called upon by duty to preach the Goſpel to unbelieving nations; after having laid the foundation in natural religion, you would, according to your profeſſed principles, explain and enforce the doctrine of three perſons and one God, as a fundamental article of revelation: from whence it demonſtratively follows, that the Goſpel which you would preach to unbelieving nations, is not the ſame, with regard to this eſſential point, that the apoſtles ſet forth upon the ſame occaſion; it being evident beyond contradiction, that the apoſtles in their diſcourſes recorded in the Acts, have not only omitted the doctrine of three perſons and one God, but have likewiſe delivered a character of the one ſupreme God inconſiſtent with it; which appears ſo very ſtrong even in your own eyes, that you are forced to ſuppoſe without any ſort of proof, that the apoſtles ſupplied this omiſſion in part of their diſcourſes not written by St. Luke, tho' his profeſſed view was to give a faithful account of the firſt propagation of chriſtianity; and what were the conditions required of Jews and heathens, when they were converted to the faith of Chriſt.

However you flatter yourſelf that you have found a diſcourſe in the Acts addreſſed to converts, where St. Paul ſpeaks in a way ſomething different from what he did to Jews and heathens. It will be proper to examine this diſcourſe. In Acts xx. we have an account of St. Paul's taking his final leave of the elders of the church of Epheſus, and *calling them to witneſs* (as you rightly obſerve) *that he had declared to them the whole council of God.* Ver. 21. the apoſtle clearly explains, what was the main purport of the doctrine he inculcated upon

all

all occaſions; *teſtifying both to the Jews and alſo to the Greeks repentance towards God, and faith toward our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* This is exactly agreeable to the doctrine he had delivered in his other diſcourſes, and particularly Acts xvii. we have a plain account of God, and of Chriſt: but I muſt beg leave to aſk how it is poſſible to extract the doctrine of three perſons and one God from this ſolemn declaration of St. Paul, when he was profeſſedly ſetting forth the eſſential points of chriſtianity? But you lay the greateſt ſtreſs upon the 27th and 28th verſes: *Counſel of God. Take heed therefore to yourſelves and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghoſt hath made you overſeers to feed the church of God, which he hath purchaſed with his own blood.* You obſerve upon this, "that there are three perſons diſtinctly ſignified, while two of them are characterized by the name of God, namely, *counſel of God*, who is the Father, and *the church of God*, who is the Son; and to the third, namely, the Holy Ghoſt, the peculiar office of God is emphatically attributed; who therefore with the other two, muſt be one God bleſſed for ever: and yet this paſſage you prudently ſlur over by barely aſſerting, that the moſt ancient manuſcripts read the words, *the church of God, the church of the Lord*; and then boldly appeal to the learned for the truth of your aſſertion. But for this general appeal to the learned, you ſeem to be ſupported only by Dr. Clarke, and perhaps one or two more: but why did not you let your illiterate reader know, that others as learned, and by far more numerous, have, on a critical and impartial comparing of manuſcripts, clearly decided for the common reading, as it ſtands in our tranſlation?"

Anſ.

Anſ. Let the premiſes be what they will, you perpetually draw your favourite concluſion, namely, the doctrine of three perſons and one God. If St. Paul had intended any ſuch notion, he could have expreſſed it as eaſily, as you do for him. You are obliged to grant, that one of the three Perſons is not expreſsly called God; and yet you include him in the notion of the one God, becauſe he, namely, the Holy Ghoſt, is ſaid to do what the ſame Apoſtle attributes to God, as ſhewn above, 1 Cor. xii. 28. This has been effectually anſwered above; ſurely God may very properly be ſaid to perform what he enables an inferior inſtrument to do. The very ſame argument, on which your cauſe chiefly depends, will equally prove that Angels, and other Beings, are included in the notion of the one God; for they likewiſe, are frequently repreſented as doing what God is expreſly declared to perform. Thus Judg. xxi. *The angel of the Lord ſaid, I made you to go up out of Egypt, which in other paſſages is appropriated to the one ſupreme God.* As to the expreſſion, *the church of God*, admitting this to be the true reading, God may here ſignify the Father, though the following words, *he hath purchaſed with his own blood*, refer to Chriſt, of which there is a parallel inſtance in 1 John iii. 5. Ye know that *he* was manifeſted to take away ſin, and in *him* is no ſin; *he* and *him* certainly refer to Chriſt, though there be no mention of him in the context: ver. 1. Behold, what manner of love the *Father* hath beſtowed upon us, &c. But with regard to the word *God*, common chriſtians have a right to be informed, (I mean, unleſs we act upon the principles of popery) that the church of the Lord is the moſt probable reading

ing*. But admitting that the word, *God*, was the true reading, and that it was applied to Chriſt, how does this prove the doctrine of three perſons and one God, of which there is an abſolute ſilence? and indeed it muſt appear infinitely improbable to any unprejudiced perſons, that St. Paul ſhould in ver. 27, 28. deliver a doctrine inconſiſtent with what he had ſolemnly profeſſed as the ſummary of the chriſtian faith in ver. 21.

It is proper to add, that I made ſome general obſervations upon the diſcourſes of the apoſtles in the Acts, p. 28, 29. which you have left in their full ſtrength, without any ſort of anſwer.

1 Cor. xi. 3. I referred this to the common ſenſe of my chriſtian readers, as not requiring any particular explication. It is indeed ſufficient to read the words in order to be convinced that Chriſt is

* The ſtate of the caſe is this: the church of the Lord, (or of Chriſt) is in the Alexandrian, Beza's, as well as ſeveral other manuſcripts. Again, *the church of the Lord* is quoted by ſeveral ancient writers, Irenæus, Origen, the Syriack verſion, apoſtolical conſtitutions, and Ignatius's larger epiſtles. Theſe latter indeed are books of doubtful authority: but it adds great weight to the probability of the church of the Lord being the true reading, that it is quoted in this manner by Athanaſians in the 4th and 5th centuries. The only Greek authorities for the common reading, are the ſmaller epiſtles of Ignatius, which may be juſtly eſteemed of doubtful authority, and ſome copies of Athanaſius, whereas ſeveral of his manuſcripts have, the church of the Lord. It is worth obſerving, that Dr. Waterland in his celebrated Defences of his Queries, and Sermons, namely, lady Moyer's lectures, where he was collecting as many texts as poſſible to Prove the Athanaſian doctrine, has omitted this text of Acts xx. 28. I obſerve the ſame omiſſion in Dr. Randolph's late Vindication of the Trinity, occaſioned by the Eſſay on Spirit: all which plainly ſhews, that not only Dr. Clarke, but ſome of the moſt judicious Athanaſians ſeem to have decided againſt the common reading; and that I was furniſhed with ſtrong evidence in ſupport of what I advanced.

inferior

inferior to God. In anſwer to this, you obſerve that "the meaning by comparing Epheſ. v. 32, and likewiſe 23. is no more than that as Chriſt and the church are one body, but Chriſt the head; and the man and wife one fleſh, but man the head; ſo God and man are one Chriſt, but God the head." p. 40.

Anſ. Here you confound the literal and figurative ſenſe. Chriſt and the church are in the figurative ſenſe repreſented as one body, whereof Chriſt is the head; but it is impoſſible to underſtand this in the literal ſenſe, as if Chriſt and all true chriſtians were one and the ſame being. So the man and wife, though figuratively repreſented as one fleſh, cannot poſſibly be underſtood as one being; and therefore when you draw your compariſon, *ſo God and man are one Chriſt, but God the head*; you argue from the figurative to the ſtrictly literal ſenſe, and really make Chriſt an intelligent being conſiſting of God and man, but God the head. In this compariſon you take it for granted without proof, that St. Paul had the ſame notion with you concerning the nature of Chriſt, namely, that it conſiſts of a divine part, ſoul and body, to which he was an abſolute ſtranger. Nothing can be plainer than St. Paul's meaning: as Chriſt is a diſtinct being from men who compoſe the church, and as the man and wife are two diſtinct beings; ſo God and Chriſt are two diſtinct beings, and Chriſt is as certainly inferior to God, as the wife is to the huſband, and the church to Chriſt.

1 Cor. xv. 24, 27, 28.

You have little to object to my interpretation of this remarkable paſſage: only you obſerve "that Chriſt's mediatorſhip will ceaſe after the final judgment;

ment; his kingdom, as mediator of the new covenant, will then of courſe ceaſe alſo: but the kingdom and throne of the Son, as being one God with the Father, is notwithſtanding declared to be everlaſting and for ever and ever. His dominion is an everlaſting dominion, Dan. vii. 14. Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: Pſalm xlv. 6. applied to Chriſt, Heb. i. 8. and, Thou art the ſame, and thy years ſhall not fail. Again, Luke i. 33. He ſhall reign over the houſe of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there ſhall be no end. It is neceſſary to obſerve here, that the term, *God*, in the 24th verſe of 1 Cor. xv. is particularly determined by the additional expreſſion, even the Father, to denote the perſon of the Father; while the ſame term, *God*, in the 28th verſe, by the comprehenſive expreſſion, all in all, is deſigned to point out the whole Trinity, now manifeſted, conſiſtently to ſubſiſt, in the perfect unity of the ſupreme Godhead." p. 40, 41.

Anſ. When it is declared, that the kingdom of Chriſt is an everlaſting kingdom, of which there ſhall be no end, the meaning is, that it ſhall never be deſtroyed by any oppoſite power, but ſhall completely ſubdue all things to itſelf; which grand purpoſe being thoroughly accompliſhed, Chriſt will then reſign all his power and authority into the hands of God, from whom he received it, that God may immediately govern and influence all. This I apprehend to be a clear and rational account of this glorious diſpenſation: but your diſtinction of the mediatorial kingdom, and of the kingdom of the Son, as being one God with the Father, has no foundation in ſcripture, and is inconſiſtent with the texts brought to prove it. The everlaſting kingdom propheſied of in Dan.

vii.

vii. 14. is expreſly ſaid to be given to the Son of man by the Ancient of days, that is, the one ſupreme God, and conſequently muſt refer to the mediatorial kingdom. So likewiſe, Thy throne, O God, Pſalm xlv. 6. quoted in the epiſtle to the Hebrews, neceſſarily refers to the kingdom of Chriſt as mediator, as undeniably appears from verſe the 9th. As to the 12th verſe, which you ſuppoſe applied to Chriſt, it is directed to God the Father, as ſhall be ſhewn in its proper place. With reſpect to Luke i. 33. it is but reading the former verſe, and it will immediately appear, that the kingdom of the Mediator is neceſſarily ſignified: ver. 32. He ſhall be great, and ſhall be called the Son of the Higheſt; and *the Lord God ſhall give unto him the throne of his father David.* When you interpret the term, *God*, in the 28th verſe of the whole Trinity, becauſe he is ſaid to be all in all, I call this a mere arbitrary invention of your own, without the leaſt colour of evidence to ſupport it; the plain ſenſe of the apoſtle being evidently this, that from henceforth God would immediately, without any mediator, govern and influence all. It is really an infinite abſurdity to ſuppoſe, that God in the 28th verſe ſhould ſignify a different being from God in the 27th verſe, who is expreſly determined to be the Father.

Philipp. ii. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.

You remind me upon this paſſage that I wave my uſual method of drawing conſequences from the tranſlated text, and obtrude upon my reader a figurative and forced interpretation as the univerſal ſenſe of all the learned; which yet is no more than that of my wonted leader Dr. Clarke, while the learned Hammond, Pearſon, and many others

others, evidently ſhew the contrary ſenſe to be the true meaning.

Anſ. Admitting for the preſent, that the tranſlated text does not convey the true ſenſe of the original, I muſt inſiſt upon it, that common Chriſtians ought to have the true and genuine ſenſe laid before them. We blame the Papiſts for not ſuffering the common people to read the Scripture: and do not Proteſtants ſo far reſemble them, as they endeavour to hide the true ſenſe of Scripture, by any falſe tranſlation? Is not this a manifeſt impoſition upon their underſtandings? And, conſequently, I thought myſelf obliged by a regard to truth, to give them what I thought the right ſenſe of this remarkable paſſage. Neither, did I pretend to ſay, that my ſenſe was confirmed by *all* the learned; but I appealed to the learned in general, for its being the ſenſe of ſeveral very judicious men, beſides Dr. Clarke, and what all the learned muſt allow, the words in the original are capable of.

You are obliged to grant, that my tranſlation, *was not eager to retain*, may be admitted, inſtead of the common rendering, *thought it not robbery*, this part being given up, by ſeveral judicious Athanaſians. But you contend, that *the form of God*, denotes the nature of God, or the eſſential perfections of the divine nature, and that our tranſlation *to be equal with God* is ſtrictly right. The true ſenſe of the paſſage, according to your interpretation is this: "Who being in the form of God (of the ſame nature with God), *thought it not robbery to be equal with God*, or, was not eager to claim the right of equality (which the ſameneſs of nature entitled him to), *but made himſelf of no reputation* (diveſted himſelf of that right, for it is

plain he could not diveſt himſelf of his nature) taking upon him the form, (the nature) of a ſervant, being made in the likeneſs of men; and being found in faſhion as a man, humbled himſelf (yet further), *&c.* For this exemplary humiliation of Chriſt, ——— St. Paul very properly declares that God *exalted* him, now in the likeneſs of a man, and gave him a name, to wit, Jeſus, the name by which his humanity is deſigned; in which name, in conſideration of which humanity, every tongue ſhould confeſs, that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord to the glory of God the Father, with whom God the Son is declared to be originally one and the ſame, as well in nature, as in dominion and power." Pages 42, 43.

Anſ. It is a very good rule in interpreting Scripture, not to found important doctrines upon ſingle texts of a doubtful meaning. It is not to be imagined, that St. Paul intended to aſſert, that Chriſt aſſumed to be equal with God, without referring to ſome very ſtrong pretenſions, that our Lord had made to ſuch an equality: if any ſuch undeniably appeared in the accounts given of him, by the four Evangeliſts, it might in that caſe be of ſome uſe to confirm your interpretation. But ſince the fact is far otherwiſe, and all the diſcourſes recorded of our Saviour, are evidently calculated to maintain the ſupremacy of his God and Father, and his own inferiority, entire dependence upon, and obedience to, Almighty God; it ſeems highly improbable that St. Paul ſhould maintain his equality with the Father in this ſingle text, as we have no other texts that convey any ſuch notion; and eſpecially ſince the interpretation you contend for, is attended with unanſwerable objections.

The

The form of God in this paſſage, cannot reaſonably be ſuppoſed to relate to the nature and perfections of God, in the ſtrict and metaphyſical ſenſe, but, according to the uſe of the word in other places, it denotes the appearance and likeneſs of God. Thus it ſignifies, Mark xvi. 12. After that he appeared unto them in *another form*, unto two of them, as they walked and went into the country: form here has no ſort of relation to metaphyſical eſſence, but naturally ſignifies a different ſhape, or likeneſs, from what he had before, when he appeared to Mary Magdalene. Again, the word *form* is uſed in the following verſe, *and took upon him the form of a ſervant*. The form of a ſervant, or ſlave, denotes the likeneſs of a ſlave. Our Saviour, whilſt he was upon earth, never was a ſlave in the literal ſenſe, but he took upon him the likeneſs of one; as appears in ſeveral inſtances, by condeſcending to perform ſuch offices as are uſually done by ſlaves. Thus our Saviour himſelf ſpeaks, Luke xxii. 27. I am among you, as he that *ſerveth*. He likewiſe ſubmitted to ſuch treatment, as ſlaves commonly meet with; and at laſt the death he ſuffered was that of a ſlave, and not of a freed-man. The form, or likeneſs of a ſlave, anſwers to the form, or likeneſs of God, and confirms the ſenſe given of the form of God. But ſtill it may be aſked, what is the true import of the form, or likeneſs of God? This may be anſwered by the expreſs words of Scripture: as Chriſt is repreſented, the *brightneſs of his Father's glory*, and *the expreſs Image of his Perſon*, *the Image of the inviſible God*, *and the firſt-born of every Creature*; upon theſe and other accounts, he might be juſtly ſaid to have the form, or likeneſs of God. With reſpect to the expreſ-

ſion, *to be equal with God*, it undeniably appears by many examples, that it means no more than to be * like God. That the form of God, and to be equal *with God*, cannot poſſibly ſignify Chriſt's having the nature and perfections of God, or an abſolute equality with the Father, is extremely evident from the following words, *he made himſelf of no reputation*, which you are obliged to render as I have done, he emptied himſelf, or diveſted himſelf (of that form of God, which he before poſſeſſed). But if the form of God neceſſarily denotes the nature and perfections of God, and an equality with him, how was it poſſible he ſhould diveſt himſelf of that form, ſince one of the eſſential perfections of God is immutability? You cannot help ſeeing this groſs abſurdity, and ſo you endeavour to evade it by this rendering; *he diveſted himſelf of that right of equality (which the ſameneſs of nature entitled him to)*; for it is plain (as you well obſerve) he could not diveſt himſelf of his nature: but the misfortune is, there is nothing in the original to anſwer the word *right*; this is an inſertion of your own to palliate a glaring abſurdity: whatever be the preciſe idea of the form of God, of this the Apoſtle expreſsly ſays he diveſted himſelf, not in appearance only, but in reality; which demonſtrates the falſhood of the Athanaſian doctrine, it being on all ſides agreed, that the one ſupreme God cannot diveſt himſelf of his immutable nature. But let *the form of God*, be interpreted a likeneſs of God, the Apoſtle's ex-

* Let the inſtances produced by Dr. Whitby, out of the Septuagint be examined. Job v. xiv. Chap. x. 10. xi. 12. xiii. 12, 20. xv. 16. xxiv. 20. xxvii. 16. xxviii. 2. xxix. 14. xl. 15. Iſaiah li. 23. Wiſdom vii. 1, 3. In all theſe texts, ὡσὰ is uſed adverbially, and ſignifies *as*, or *like*.

preſſion

preſſion is ſtrictly true; he really diveſted himſelf of that likeneſs of God, by taking upon him human nature. The humiliation of Chriſt does not conſiſt in his diveſting himſelf, of his right of equality with God, to which Chriſt never made the leaſt pretenſions; but the true notion of this wonderful diſpenſation is, that though our Saviour had exiſted in ſo glorious and god-like a ſtate, yet he condeſcended ſo far as really to become man, and in this ſtate of humiliation did really ſuffer for our ſins, of which the one ſupreme God is abſolutely incapable. We ſeem agreed, that for the exemplary humiliation of Chriſt, God exalted him and gave him a name, That at the name of Jeſus every knee ſhould bow, and that every tongue ſhould confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. But if God did really exalt Chriſt, that is, raiſe him to a higher dignity than he had before; (which is the ſtrict meaning of the Greek word, as obſerved in the Appeal, to which you have given no anſwer), if God gave him as matter of favour; (which is the ſtrict meaning of the Greek word, neither have you contradicted it) and if the honour given to Chriſt redounds to the glory of God the Father, the ſupreme benefactor, it neceſſarily follows that Chriſt cannot poſſibly be a perſon equal to the one ſupreme God: the voice of common ſenſe loudly proteſts againſt it, it being abſolutely impoſſible that God ſhould be raiſed to a higher dignity than he had before; that he ſhould have any thing given him as matter of favour; or that he ſhould be honoured to the glory of another perſon: and, conſequently, I cannot be juſtly charged with impoſing upon my readers; but, upon a review, have the ſatisfaction to find, that I have laid be-

fore them the moſt rational ſenſe of this celebrated paſſage. It is obſervable, that I made uſe of an argument, to confirm my ſenſe drawn from St. Paul's own declaration, upon another occaſion, which has appeared ſo very ſtrong even to your underſtanding, that you have not ſo much as attempted to give it an anſwer. [See Appeal, p. 32. 2d edit.] You act prudently, for turn it which way you will, it is really unanſwerable by the art of man.

As to your remaining obſervation, that my interpretation weakens the argument for Chriſt's humility, becauſe it ſuppoſes Chriſt to be a perſon inferior to God, though I expreſsly aſcribe to him, a preheminence above all other beings; I anſwer, in all queſtions of this kind, namely, which depend upon meer revelation, we muſt not form interpretations according to our own arbitrary ſcheme, but the very Scripture truth. To make Chriſt equal to God, renders his condeſcenſion, at firſt view, very extraordinary. But the misfortune is, the thing itſelf is abſolutely impoſſible in nature, it is expreſsly contradicted in part of this paſſage, and numberleſs other paſſages of Scripture. That ſo glorious and divine a perſon as the firſt-born of every creature, ſhould ſtoop ſo low for the ſake of man, is an unparallelled inſtance of humility, and far beyond all poſſible examples, that can be produced in the hiſtory of the world, and, conſequently, might with the higheſt reaſon be urged to the Philippians, and all Chriſtians, as an extraordinary caſe, and what deſerves their higheſt reſpect and imitation. When you obſerve, that Chriſt's merit, according to my ſenſe, is leſſened by an aſſured proſpect of much higher advancement; and that the Apoſtle has guarded againſt this

this notion, by pronouncing him to have been *in the form of God, and equal with God*; I muſt remind you of the caution you ſhould obſerve of drawing conſequences from texts not rightly rendered, which expreſsly contradict other plain declarations. The ſame St. Paul has plainly told us, that Chriſt *for the joy that was ſet before him, endured the croſs, deſpiſing the ſhame, and is ſet down at the right hand of the throne of God.* Heb. xii. 2. This, according to your way of thinking, leſſens the merit of Chriſt. But all ſober Chriſtians muſt allow, that St. Paul underſtood the true nature of Chriſt's humiliation and exaltation, much better than divines of latter ages; and it ſhould oblige you, to take a ſerious review of the doctrine you are labouring to ſupport, which forces you to ſuch terrible ſhifts, as to fix an imaginary reproach upon St. Paul, as well as his humble follower.

Coloſs. i. 15. Revel. iii. 14. With regard to the firſt of theſe declarations, you obſerve, that "Chriſt is not repreſented as the image of God taken abſolutely, (namely, as ſignifying Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, according to your interpretation;) but of the perſon of the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt."

Anſ. Very true, Chriſt is the image of the Father, the inviſible God cannot poſſibly have any other ſignification: for, as I have obſerved above, God abſolutely taken, never ſignifies Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, but always the Father. Chriſt is ſtiled the image of the inviſible God, as the perfections of God, do more eminently ſhine forth in him, than any other being. The Father alone, is in the New Teſtament deſcribed as the inviſible God, which you are obliged to grant:

but you endeavour to take off from the force of it, by assuming that Christ has the same divine nature with the Father, with respect to which he is equally invisible with the Father, and is comprehended under the character of the one supreme Almighty God. *Ans.* That Christ has the same divine nature with the Father, is a groundless notion sufficiently confuted in these papers; neither can one clear passage be produced, where Christ is necessarily included in the notion of the one supreme God.

As to St. Paul's calling Christ, The first-born of every creature, and St. John's styling him, The beginning of the creation of God, you positively assert that I have given a false translation from the Greek. Ans. *The first-born of every creature*, is justly rendered in our English translation, and necessarily signifies the first being whom God produced, or created: this sense is confirmed by all the parallel texts. Matth. i. 25. Luke ii. 7. Rom. viii. 29. Col. i. 18. Heb. i. 6.—xi. 28. xii. 23. Revel. i. 5. Again, *the beginning of the creation of God*, necessarily denotes the first being whom God created, as all the parallel places undeniably prove. Matth. xxiv. 8, 21. Mark i. 1. x. 6.—xiii. 8, 19. John ii. 11. Philip. iv. 15. Heb. iii. 14.—v. 12.—vi. 1.—vii. 3. 2 Pet. iii. 4. In order to give the English reader, a notion of the truth of this interpretation, let it be observed, that as the beginning of sorrows (αρχη ωδινων), Matth. xxiv. 8. signifies the first of sorrows; and the beginning of miracles (αρχην σημειων) signifies the first of miracles, John ii. 11. which Jesus worked; so the beginning of the creation of God (αρχη κτισεως Θεϑ) Revel. iii. 14. signifies the first of the

the creation of God, or the firſt being whom God created *.

As to the firſt, namely, firſt-born of every creature, you rightly obſerve, that the Apoſtle in the very next verſe aſſigns the reaſon at large, ver. 16. *For in him were all things created that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, viſible and inviſible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things* (without any exception) *were created by him, and for him.* This verſe contains a full proof of our Saviour's being produced before all creatures; otherwiſe, God could not have employed him as an inſtrument in creating them.

But in order to evade the plain and literal ſenſe of the firſt-born of every creature, confirmed by parallel expreſſions, you obſerve, "that *in him* has a different ſenſe from *by, or through him*, and that it ſignifies the immenſity of his nature, an all-ſufficiency, and having in himſelf the power of ſupplying to himſelf all neceſſary materials whereon to work; and therefore *in him*, muſt expreſs the higheſt efficiency of Chriſt in the work of creation, in oppoſition to the notion of his being only an inſtrument; from whence you infer, that he is God in the ſtricteſt ſenſe. But according to the interpretation in the Appeal, Chriſt muſt then not only have created himſelf, but created himſelf, in himſelf, and for himſelf, and therefore that ſenſe cannot be the true one. But the meaning of St. Paul, agreeable to the reaſon which he gives ver. 16. muſt be, that Chriſt is not only before all creatures, but the Lord of all creatures, or rather the

* αρχη with a genitive caſe, is never uſed in an active ſenſe in the New Teſtament.

heir

heir of the whole creation, in alluſion to the courſe of inheritance amongſt men, according to which, the firſt-born is the heir and Lord of all his Father's poſſeſſions; and to whom therefore, the joint management and care of them is in due time entruſted."

Anſ. It is the ſolemn determination of the ſacred writers, that the one God and Father of all, is the creator of all things; it is likewiſe no leſs clearly determined, that Chriſt is an inferior inſtrument, employed by God in the work of creation. Thus St. Paul expreſsly ſays, 1 Cor. viii. 6. *To us* (namely, Chriſtians), *there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him, and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by (or through) whom are all things, and we by (or through) him. In him*, in the 16th verſe, has naturally the ſame ſignification with *by him, or through him*, in the latter end of the verſe; which was not intended by the Apoſtle to ſet forth any thing, different from what was expreſſed in the beginning, but only to ſum up in general, what he had ſpecified in particulars, and therefore *in him* (which is juſtly rendered in our Engliſh tranſlation *by him*), denotes the ſame with *by*, or through, *him*. Nothing * is more common in all ſorts of writers, than to expreſs the ſame thing by different terms. As therefore, the inſtrumental agency of Chriſt is expreſſed by the particles *in* (ἐν), and *by* (διὰ), what you build upon the ſuppoſition, that *in* denotes the immenſity of the divine nature, falls to the ground.

* The prepoſition *in* (ἐν), is frequently uſed in this ſenſe, Acts xvii. 31. *By that man* (ἐν). 1 Cor. xii. 3. *By the Holy Ghoſt* (ἐν). In Stephens's Greek Concordance of the New Teſtament, it is particularly taken notice of, that ἐν is of the ſame import with διὰ, or through, John i. 4.

As to your obſervation, that Chriſt, as it is interpreted in the Appeal, muſt have created himſelf, becauſe *all things* are ſaid to be created through him, the pertinence of it entirely depends upon taking *all things* in the ſtrict univerſal ſenſe, in which Chriſt is included: you are obliged to grant, that ſuch expreſſions muſt often be interpreted with exceptions, and the neceſſity of it in this particular inſtance plainly appears. Chriſt is ſtiled the firſt-born of every creature; for by him all things were created, that is, all other beings, which could not poſſibly have been, if he had not exiſted firſt himſelf. My ſenſe then of the firſt-born of every creature, is plain, literal, and rational, perfectly conſiſtent with the verſe immediately following: but the ſenſe you would fix upon this expreſſion, is figurative and far-fetched, drawn from the cuſtoms of men, whereby the firſt-born is the heir and Lord of his Father's poſſeſſions; you do not ſo much as pretend to confirm your ſenſe by parallel expreſſions from the New Teſtament, whereas mine is effectually eſtabliſhed by every inſtance there occurring. It is obſervable, that you refer to ver. 18. where Chriſt is ſtiled *the firſt-born from the dead*, which neceſſarily ſignifies the firſt being whom God raiſed from the dead; and exactly for the ſame reaſon, *the firſt-born of every creature*, muſt ſignify the firſt being whom God created.

Your next obſervation relating to Revel. iii. 17. is fully anſwered under the laſt head.

I produced ſeveral other texts in the Appeal, p. 33. 2d. edit. which undeniably demonſtrate to common ſenſe, the inferiority of Chriſt to the great God and Father of all; you endeavour to evade theſe texts, by the uſual diſtinction of the divine

divine and human nature of our Saviour, a meer invention of the learned to ſolve unanſwerable difficulties, ariſing from the Athanaſian ſcheme, which ſhall be conſidered in its proper place.

I took notice in the Appeal of Chriſt being deſcribed in Revelations under the character of a lamb, and that he is carefully diſtinguiſhed from him that ſitteth on the throne, namely, the Lord God Almighty. In anſwer to this you labour to confound him with his God and Father, becauſe "he is repreſented as not only having, but ſitting on the ſame throne, Revel. iii. 21.—iv. 2, 3.—v. 6.—xxii. 1, 3. And, as judge of the quick and dead, is again repreſented, xx. 11, &c. ſitting upon the throne, and expreſly called God: as the context of that and the next chapter do plainly and fully evidence: eſpecially when compared with Matth. xxv. 31, &c. together with the character whereby he that ſitteth on the throne deſcribes himſelf; which very character is appropriated to Chriſt, i. 11.—xxii. 12."

Anſ. Your way of quoting texts to eſtabliſh the ſupreme divinity of Chriſt undeniably ſhews the deficiency of any direct proofs; it is conſequential only, which is very fallacious in many inſtances, nothing being more common than for the ſame thing to be applied to perſons of a very different rank, eſpecially when inferiors act by commiſſion from, and in ſubordination to, their principles. I have effectually obviated the argument ariſing from ſome of theſe texts, namely, Revel. iii. 21.—xx. 11, 12. compared with Matth. xxv. 31. See above, p. 50, 51, 52, &c.

You have added John v. 22. which confirms my anſwer given above; *the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son.* The dead may be properly ſaid to ſtand before God, even

even the Father, becauſe Chriſt judgeth them by an expreſs commiſſion from God. The perſon who is repreſented as ſitting upon the throne, Revel. xx. 11. is God the Father, it being the peculiar deſcription of the Father through the book of Revelation, and in ſome paſſages he is expreſly diſtinguiſhed from the lamb by this deſcription. There is but one text in this book, wherein Chriſt is repreſented as ſitting upon a throne, namely, Rev. iii. 21. and remarkable it is, that his inferiority to the Father is at the ſame time clearly eſtabliſhed. See above, p. 50, 51. As to Rev. iv. 2, 3. nothing can be more plain to the moſt common reader, than that the perſon who *ſat on the throne*, is the *Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come, who liveth for ever and ever*, it being the manifeſt deſign of this chapter to ſet forth the worſhip of the one ſupreme God and Lord of the univerſe. With what view you refer to chap. v. ver. 6. I cannot conceive: *and I beheld, and lo, in the midſt of the throne, and of the four beaſts, and in the midſt of the elders ſtood a lamb as it had been ſlain, having ſeven horns and ſeven eyes, which are the ſeven ſpirits of God ſent forth into all the earth.* Would you infer that the lamb is the perſon, who in the foregoing chapter ſat on the throne? this whole 5th chapter, and particularly the verſe you have referred to, undeniably ſhew the contrary. The lamb is in the moſt ſolemn manner diſtinguiſhed from *him that ſat upon the throne*, by taking the book out of his right hand. Ver. 7. he is no leſs remarkably diſtinguiſhed from God, ver. 9, 10. Bleſſing and honour, &c. are aſcribed *to him that ſitteth upon the throne, and unto the lamb for ever and ever*, ver. 13. It is obſervable that the lamb is deſcribed, ver. 6. not as ſitting upon the throne, but

but as ſtanding in the midſt of the throne, and of the four beaſts, and in the midſt of the elders. I ſhall have occaſion to conſider this chapter in the progreſs of the debate. Chap. xxii. ver. 1, 3. The throne is ſtiled *the throne of God and of the lamb*. But does this prove, that the lamb is equal to God, from whom he is thus diſtinguiſhed, and from obedience to whom all the honour aſcribed to him, is undeniably derived? It is true that Chriſt is ſtiled Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, as well as the one ſupreme God who ſat upon the throne; but there is a wide difference in the manner of the application, as appears by chap. i. which ſhall be more particularly ſhown in its proper place. As to Revel. xxii. 12. Chriſt himſelf ſpeaks *as coming quickly*; ſo likewiſe verſe 7. But I do not find this expreſſion, when God the Father is repreſented as ſpeaking.

Your next obſervation relating to the worſhip of the lamb, ſhall be conſidered under the article of worſhip.

To my obſervation that the lamb is carefully diſtinguiſhed from the Lord God, and particularly Revel. xv. 3. you anſwer, "that it is more than probable that the Lord God Almighty, Revel. xv. 3. comprehends both Father and Son. Your reaſons in effect are theſe: the ſong of Moſes and the ſong of the lamb are not to be conſidered as the ſame; becauſe the ſong was ſung by Moſes, but no ſong is expreſsly ſaid to be ſung by the lamb. On the contrary, in Revel. we have ſeveral ſongs addreſſed to the lamb; as in chap. v. 8, &c. and the whole is concluded *to him that liveth for ever and ever*, the very character by which Chriſt deſcribes himſelf, chap. i. 18. And again, chap vii. 9, 10, 11, 12. in the concluſion of which

chap-

chapter, God and the lamb are repreſented jointly performing the ſame offices. Again, chap. xi. 15, 16, 17, 18. the joint dominion of Father and Son is plainly ſpecified; the deſcription in the 17th verſe, particularly referring to Chriſt, from the very reaſon there aſſigned, *becauſe thou haſt taken unto thee thy great power and haſt reigned.* Now it cannot properly be ſaid that God the Father at any time reſigned his power and did not actually reign: this reaſon therefore muſt regard the Son, who emptied himſelf of the form of God, and put on the form of a ſervant, and afterwards reaſſumed the glory which he had before with his Father. The account which follows in the 18th ver. of the future general judgment, ſeems to be a further proof of theſe paſſages relating to Chriſt, as the execution of this office was particularly aſſigned to him. But moreover by comparing Revel. chap. xiv. 3. Heb. xii. 22. Revel. xxii. 3. with Revel. xv. 2. it may ſeem that the ſong of the lamb was not ſo ſtiled, becauſe ſung by him, as the other ſong had been by Moſes, but becauſe it was addreſſed to the lamb myſteriouſly comprehended in the one God."

Anſ. I grant you on the one ſide, that there is no expreſs mention of the lamb joining in the ſong, as Moſes did; and on the other ſide I grant you purſuant to my own quotations in the Appeal, that there are ſome ſongs in Revel. addreſſed to the Lamb; particularly, Revel. v. 8, 9, &c. chap. vii. 9, 10. but that the ſolemn worſhip and adoration ſet forth at the concluſion of the 5th chap. is directed to Chriſt, may very reaſonably be denied. In the foregoing verſe, *Bleſſing* is aſcribed *to him that ſitteth upon the throne, and unto the lamb for ever and ever.* Then the *four beaſts ſaid, Amen.*

Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worſhipped him that liveth for ever; who can be no other perſon or being than the one ſupreme God and Father of all, as undeniably appears from the whole foregoing chapter, and particularly the 10th verſe. The four and twenty elders fall down before him that ſat on the throne, and worſhip him that liveth for ever and ever. Here the perſon who liveth for ever and ever, is expreſly determined to be the ſame who ſat on the throne: but in the 5th chapter the perſon who ſat on the throne, is in the moſt ſolemn manner diſtinguiſhed from the lamb, ver. 7, 13. and, conſequently, the worſhip paid *to him that liveth for ever and ever*, ver. 14. is paid to the Lord God Almighty, and not to the lamb. Neither is Chriſt ever deſcribed with this very character in the abſolute ſenſe of *living for ever and ever:* what Chriſt ſays of himſelf, chap. i. 18. is this; *I am he that liveth and was dead; and behold, I am alive for ever and ever*; which is widely different from the character of him *who liveth for ever and ever* in the ſupreme and abſolute ſenſe, as being the grand ſource of life to all beings, and from whom the Son himſelf has *received* his life and power to live for ever and ever.—So likewiſe in the 7th chap. verſe 10. *ſalvation* is aſcribed to *our God who ſitteth upon the throne, and unto the lamb.* But in the next verſe, ſolemn worſhip is expreſly ſaid to be paid by the angels to God, or our God, who in verſe 10. is expreſly diſtinguiſhed from the lamb by the title of *our God who ſitteth upon the throne.* To imagine the lamb included in the notion of *our God*, is a manifeſt perverſion of all language and ſentiment, and introduces the moſt groſs confuſion into the ſacred writings. As to God and the lamb being re-

repreſented as jointly performing the ſame offices in the concluſion of this chapter, namely, 7th ver. I obſerve that God is diſtinguiſhed from the lamb by the uſual deſcription of *ſitting upon the throne*, ver. 15. and the lamb is deſcribed as being in *the midſt of the throne*, ver. 17. God is ſaid to *wipe away all tears from* the *eyes* of his faithful and perſecuted ſervants, and Chriſt *the lamb* is ſaid *to feed them and lead them unto living fountains of waters*, agreeably to the grand oeconomy of our ſalvation, all true chriſtians being under the protection, and enjoying the favour, of God and Chriſt, as it was affectionately repreſented by our Lord, when he was upon earth, John xiv. 23. *If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.* But how does it follow from hence, that God and the lamb are the ſame being, the ſame one ſupreme God? This is a conſequential doctrine invented by men, and is expreſly contradicted in almoſt every page of the New Teſtament.

With reſpect to chap. xi. 15. the *kingdoms of this world* are declared to be *the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Chriſt, and he ſhall reign for ever and ever.* This is a glorious prophecy of that bleſſed time, when all the nations of the earth ſhall embrace chriſtianity, and ſhall acknowledge one ſupreme God, and one Mediator Jeſus Chriſt, and all idolatry and falſe worſhip ſhall be demoliſhed. Verſe 16, 17, 18. the four and twenty elders are repreſented as worſhipping the Lord God Almighty, agreeably to ſeveral parts of this wonderful book. Lord God Almighty, neceſſarily ſignifies the perſon of the Father; and ſo indeed does the word, *God*, through the whole book, there

being no paſſage where Chriſt has the title of God. In oppoſition to this plain and clear account, you make uſe of two arguments to prove, that Chriſt is particularly referred to in this ſolemn worſhip. As to the firſt, taken from the 17th verſe, it may eaſily be determined, in what ſenſe God is ſaid to reign by the 15th verſe; it is declared *that God will reign for ever*, becauſe *the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Chriſt*, that is, the ſupreme authority of God is acknowledged through the earth, and all falſe worſhip and idolatry are demoliſhed, which had almoſt univerſally prevailed: and therefore the four and twenty elders, verſe 17. return their ſolemn thanks to Almighty God, *becauſe he hath taken to himſelf his great power, and hath reigned*, that is, the dominion of the one ſupreme God is acknowledged through the earth in oppoſition to all civil and eccleſiaſtical authority, by which all idolatry and falſe worſhip have been ſupported in almoſt all ages and countries. God's kingdom with regard to rational creatures, conſiſts in the willing obedience of their hearts and actions to the laws of God. By idolatry and wickedneſs this kingdom is oppoſed: and it has been the grand deſign of God in all his revelations, to draw men off from idolatry and wicked practices, and lead them to the knowledge and worſhip of the one true God in the ways of purity and holineſs, juſtice and charity. Well therefore might the elders expreſs their ſolemn thanks to the one ſupreme God, when this glorious event ſhall have been accompliſhed, when true and genuine chriſtianity ſhall univerſally prevail. God may very juſtly be ſaid to have *taken this great power and to have reigned*, with reſpect to that cor-

corrupt ſtate of idolatry and wickedneſs, in which the generality of men were involved. Doubtleſs God's kingdom is univerſal, and his power infinite, neither can it ever be ſaid that he did not reign, as he has all nature at his command. But the kingdom of God principally means the government of rational creatures, who are capable of diſobeying; in which ſenſe his kingdom may be ſaid to be more or leſs extenſive, as greater or leſſer numbers of his rational creatures freely obey his righteous laws. The kingdoms of the earth, when generally idolatrous and wicked, are the kingdoms of the devil, according to ſcripture language: the ſame kingdoms, when acknowledging the one ſupreme God and one mediator Jeſus Chriſt, the kingdoms of God and of Chriſt; and God is then declared to reign, when his ſupreme dominion is acknowledged, in reference to that ſtate, when idolatry and wickedneſs generally prevailed.

Your ſecond argument to prove that the 15, 16, 17, 18. verſes of chap. xi. refer to Chriſt, has been anſwered above. See p. 51. It is agreeable to ſcripture language and ſentiment to aſcribe the judgment to come to God as well as Chriſt, who is the miniſter *appointed* by God to execute this important office.

By comparing the texts referred to, you want to prove that the new ſong, ch. xiv. 3. is the ſame with the ſong of Moſes and of the lamb, chap. xv. 3.—whether it be the ſame or not, I think it of no importance to determine, but it may be juſtly queſtioned: only I would obſerve, that in the 1ſt verſe of chap. xiv. the lamb is repreſented as ſtanding upon Mount-Sion, and with him an hundred forty and four thouſand; and in verſe

3. it is ſaid *they ſung* a new ſong; which poſſibly may imply that the lamb joined with them in the ſong. But whether he did or not, certain it is according to the whole tenor of the book of Revelation, that the ſong of Moſes and of the lamb, chap. xv. 3. is directed to the one ſupreme God and Father of all, who is deſcribed by the character of the Lord God Almighty, which is never applied to Chriſt. As Moſes was the inſtrument whom God employed in delivering the children of Iſrael from Egyptian bondage; ſo Chriſt was the perſon employed in the much greater deliverance of mankind from the ſlavery of ſin, and the puniſhment due unto it; and, conſequently, the caſes being alike may reaſonably admit a ſong of thankſgiving alike in many general expreſſions. As to the lamb being included myſteriouſly in the notion of the Lord God Almighty, it is a meer groundleſs fiction, for which you produce no evidence. But you venture to aſſert, that *the evidence of this myſtery was only revealed to the ſaints in heaven.* Whatever has been revealed to the ſaints in heaven, of which you can know no more than myſelf; I am very certain that the myſterious notion you contend for, has never yet been revealed to the ſaints on earth by any authority but that of man.

Thus I have effectually and ſolidly anſwered every particular you have advanced, to invalidate the evidence I had produced in the Appeal, to eſtabliſh the inferiority of Chriſt to the one ſupreme God and Father of all. I have taken notice of ſeveral conceſſions extorted from you by the force of truth, which overthrow the doctrine you are labouring to ſupport. In your concluſion

ſion you obſerve that "the chriſtian reader may clearly perceive that Chriſt the Son of God is upon two accounts inferior to the Father; the firſt is implied in the relation of ſonſhip and office; and the ſecond in his aſſumption of a nature made and created: at the ſame time that it is juſtly inſiſted on, that he is, in *all other reſpects*, equal to his Father, as having the ſame nature with the Father, which doctrine is ſufficiently implied and properly expreſſed in the Athanaſian creed." p. 52.

Anſ. The doctrine you profeſſedly labour to maintain, in oppoſition to the Appeal, is a coequal Trinity as ſet forth in the Athanaſian creed, which is thus expreſſed: and in this Trinity none is afore, or after other: none is greater, or leſs than another: but the whole three perſons are coeternal together, and coequal: and yet in your concluſion you are obliged to grant, that one of the perſons, namely Chriſt, is inferior to the Father upon two accounts. If he be *inferior* in *any* reſpect, it is impoſſible that he ſhould be at the ſame time *coequal and coeternal*, which neceſſarily ſignifies a ſtrict *equality* in *all* reſpects. But you are not to be blamed more than others, for running into this palpable contradiction, it being the common fate of the moſt ingenious defenders of the Athanaſian Trinity, which appears upon examination abſolutely inconſiſtent with common ſenſe, and the plain declarations of Chriſt and his apoſtles. As to that equality of nature, on which you perpetually lay the ſtreſs of the whole affair, the ſcripture has ſaid nothing relating to it, as I have ſufficiently ſhewn by a particular examination of all the different ſenſes, in which Chriſt is ſtiled the Son of God. I would earneſtly recommend the concluſion of this head, as ſet forth in the Appeal,

p. 34. 2d edit. and your concluſion to the chriſtian reader, that he may compare them together and judge between us.

You charge me with having "falſely imputed to the profeſſors of the eſtabliſhed doctrine what they manifeſtly diſclaim, namely, two perſons in Chriſt: for they hold and believe two natures united in the one perſon of Chriſt, and not two perſons." p. 52.

Anſ. The Athanaſian creed expreſly aſcribes to Chriſt two perſons, if words have any determinate meaning. A *perfect God* muſt ſurely be one perſon, and a *perfect man conſiſting of ſoul and body*, muſt be another: indeed immediately after it is ſaid, *who although he be God and man*, that is, two perſons, *yet he is not two, but one Chriſt*, that is, tho' Chriſt be really two perſons, yet he is but one perſon. But if men will aſſert in one ſentence what they expreſsly contradict in the next, who can help it? this is not a more groſs contradiction than ſeveral others, with which this famous creed ſo copiouſly abounds. I am perfectly ſatisfied upon a review, that I have fairly ſtated this important queſtion for the benefit of common chriſtians; neither can you charge me with one wilful miſrepreſentation.

I come now to conſider that part of the New Teſtament, which has afforded the moſt plauſible grounds for the Athanaſian doctrine.

It was never in my thoughts (God knows my heart) to deny any title or attribute indiſputably given to our bleſſed Saviour in Scripture, to which a real chriſtian can have no temptation. But as I am deeply convinced that the unity of God in the ſtrict and literal ſenſe, is the grand principle of natural and revealed religion; ſo I think it highly rea-

reaſonable to interpret all paſſages, that have been deemed to break in upon this important point, conſiſtently with it.

As to the argument uſually deduced from the title of God being ſometimes given to Chriſt, it cannot be thought concluſive by any unprejudiced perſon, unleſs the word, *God*, in the Old and New Teſtament was *always* uſed in the higheſt and moſt abſolute ſenſe, and *never* was upon any occaſion whatſoever applied to inferior beings. But the matter of fact is ſo clearly eſtabliſhed, namely, that the word, *God*, is frequently uſed in an inferior ſenſe by the ſacred writers, that you are obliged to acknowledge it. Add to this, that the word, *God*, is frequently uſed in an inferior ſenſe by Jewiſh and Heathen writers *. You endeavour to evade the acknowledgment of the word *God* being uſed in an inferior ſenſe by obſerving, "that the perſons, to whom this appellation is occaſionally given, are previouſly known to be by nature no Gods: and therefore theſe titles are only given to them im-

* As to the propriety of the Greek language with regard to the word, *God*, in this particular inſtance, John i. 1. I appeal to Origen and Euſebius, the moſt learned Greek fathers of the primitive church, who have taken notice of this diſtinction of God (ὁ Θεὸς) with the article, and God (Θεὸς) without the article, and expreſsly declare, that the former, according to the propriety of the Greek, denotes the Father, the unbegotten Cauſe of the univerſe, or the God over all, and that the latter ſignifies the Word, who is God, or a God after him, that is, an inferior God. Let it be obſerved, that theſe eminent fathers have made this diſtinction, when they were profeſſedly diſcourſing upon this very text of St. John. With reſpect to your obſervation, that the ſupreme Father is ſometimes ſtiled God (Θεὸς) without the article, I anſwer, that this does not invalidate a diſtinction founded upon the expreſs uſe of the article and the omiſſion of it, where two perſons are mentioned in the ſame paſſage.

properly. But with regard to our bleſſed Saviour, he is in the two following verſes of this very chapter repreſented prior to all created natures, their creator jointly with the Father, with whom he was always from the beginning with him, and conſequently coeternal." p 54.

Anſ. John i. 1. *In the beginning* moſt probably means before the Moſaic creation. But how does it follow that Chriſt muſt be coeternal with the Father, becauſe he exiſted before the creation? you infer this ſtrange doctrine from an expreſſion that conveys no ſuch notion, but ſtrongly implies the contrary. Beginning ſurely denotes ſome determinate period, but eternity has no period, no beginning. I really think that St. John's manner of expreſſion upon this occaſion, when he was profeſſedly ſetting forth the higheſt character of Chriſt, is a good argument, that Chriſt was not coeternal with the Father: for if he had been ſo, he would have expreſſed it as plainly, as you do for him. Again, you infer that Chriſt was creator of the world jointly with the Father, becauſe it is ſaid that *all things were made by, or through, him.* The expreſſion *through him* neceſſarily ſignifies a perſon miniſtring to the one ſupreme God in the creation of the world, which ſenſe is undeniably eſtabliſhed by other parts of ſcripture. *God created all things by, or through, Jeſus Chriſt,* Epheſ. iii. 9. *by whom alſo he,* namely, *God made the worlds,* Heb. i. 2. and remarkable it is that Chriſt is never ſtiled the Creator of heaven and earth; neither is there any acknowledgment made to him through the whole New Teſtament upon the account of his being employed as an inferior inſtrument in the creation of the world. Upon the whole the two verſes immediately following this declaration of St. John, *the word*

word was God, are ſo far from proving that Chriſt is ſtiled God in as high a ſenſe as the Father, that they plainly demonſtrate his inferiority. That the word, *God*, in this famous text of St. John, muſt neceſſarily be interpreted in an inferior ſenſe, appears with demonſtrative evidence from all our Saviour's diſcourſes, who has, in the moſt ſolemn manner, referred every thing to the honour of his God and Father; and hath diſclaimed the character of the one ſupreme God as ſtrongly as it is poſſible for words to expreſs it. (See inſtances produced in the Appeal, and in this Defence) I took notice in the Appeal, that our Saviour's anſwer to the Jews, when they charged him with making himſelf a God, determines this point (namely, that God is a word ſometimes uſed in the inferior ſenſe, and that it might be ſo applied to him) beyond a poſſibility of contradiction. You do not ſo much as pretend to give it a direct anſwer; but you tell me that I ſhould have produced the 30th verſe of the ſame chapter, namely, John x. where Chriſt expreſly declares himſelf *and his Father to be one*. My buſineſs was to prove from Scripture that the word, *God*, was uſed in an inferior ſenſe: for which purpoſe I produced our Saviour's authority, which is deciſive upon the point. But I was not obliged to quote the 30th verſe, *I and my Father are one*; for the accuſation of the Jews was not occaſioned by this figurative expreſſion, which probably they well underſtood, but was owing to his ſtiling God his Father, and ſo making himſelf the Son of God; ver. 25, 29. which is undeniably confirmed by our Saviour's anſwer; *Say ye of him——thou blaſphemeſt, becauſe I ſaid, I am the Son of God.* ver. 36. I diſtinctly explained in the Appeal this declaration of our Lord, *I and my Fa-*

Father are one, in its proper place. However, as I am diſpoſed to give all poſſible ſatisfaction upon this important ſubject, let the whole be carefully reviewed from the 24th ver. to the 38th incluſive, of which I will endeavour to ſet forth the moſt rational interpretation; and then I will diſtinctly conſider every thing material you have offered on the other ſide.

John x. 24. Then came the Jews round about him and ſaid unto him, how long doſt thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Chriſt, tell us plainly. Ver. 25. Jeſus anſwered, I told you, and ye believed not: the works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witneſs of me. The Jews expected an extraordinary prophet ſtiled the Meſſias, who was foretold and deſcribed in their law and the prophets: and the queſtion was, whether Jeſus was this Meſſias. Our Saviour in his anſwer refers them to the miraculous works that he performed by the power and authority of the Father, which undeniably proved his pretenſions to the character of Meſſias. Ver. 27, 28, 29. My ſheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me. And I give unto them eternal life, and they ſhall never periſh, neither ſhall any pluck them out of my hand. My Father which gave them me is greater than all; and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand. I and my Father are one. Here Chriſt repreſents good chriſtians under the figure of ſheep, and he gives them the ſtrongeſt aſſurance that they ſhould be protected and rewarded, of which this was an undeniable proof that the Father, who is greater than all, had put them under his protection, in order to confer upon them eternal life. From whence it follows, that no perſon whatſoever can deprive good chriſtians

of

of this extraordinary bleſſing, as they are guarded by the Father, the ſupreme almighty Governor; and for the ſame reaſon they are ſecure in the hands of the Son, becauſe the government of the Son is according to the will, and by the expreſs authority and power of the Father. For this plain and evident reaſon our Saviour adds, I and my Father are one, that is, it is exactly the ſame thing to be under the protection of the Son as to be under the protection of the Father, becauſe the original power and authority are in the Father, and the exerciſe of theſe he hath committed to the Son. Th s I take to be the moſt rational ſenſe of the words confirmed by parallel texts, John xvii. 22. That they (namely my diſciples) may be one, even as we (I and the Father) are one; I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one. 1 Cor. iii. 8. He that planteth and he that watereth (Paul and Apollos) are one. Ver. 31, 32, 33. Then the Jews took up ſtones again to ſtone him. Jeſus anſwered them, many good works have I ſhewed you from my Father; for which of thoſe works do ye ſtone me? The Jews anſwered him, ſaying, for a good work we ſtone thee not, but for blaſphemy, and becauſe that thou being a man, makeſt thyſelf God, or a God. They did not mean to accuſe him of being the ſupreme ſelf-exiſtent God, nor that he claimed to himſelf the ſame independent and abſolute perfection which the Father had, of which neither the Jews, nor his diſciples, could poſſibly entertain the leaſt apprehenſion, as being expreſsly contrary to all his ſolemn declarations: but the blaſphemy laid to his charge, was aſſuming to himſelf the character of a divine perſon, inveſted by his Father with extraordinary powers, becauſe he called God his Father, and claimed

claimed a peculiar authority, in conſequence of this relation. Ver. 34, 35, 36. Jeſus anſwered them, is it not written in your law, I ſaid, ye are gods? if he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the ſcripture cannot be broken: ſay ye of him whom the Father hath ſanctified, and ſent unto the world, thou blaſphemeſt, becauſe I ſaid, I am the Son of God? This reply of our Lord undeniably demonſtrates, that the Jews did not intend to charge him with making himſelf God in the higheſt ſenſe, but only the Son of God who had received extraordinary powers from his Father. I refer you to the Appeal, 2d edit. p. 87. for the force of our Saviour's argument contained in theſe words, to which you have given no anſwer. Ver. 37, 38. If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works, that ye may know and believe that the Father is in me, and I in him. Here our Lord appeals to his miraculous works as an evident proof of his extraordinary commiſſion, which laid the foundation of their charge of blaſphemy. This expreſſion, *the Father is in me and I in him*, is of the ſame import with that foregoing, ver. 30. *I and my Father are one.* As the true meaning of both plainly appears from the whole purport of our Saviour's diſcourſe, ſo it is likewiſe confirmed by parallel texts; John vi. 56. He that eateth my fleſh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. Chap. xiv. 10. Believeſt thou not, that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I ſpeak unto you, I ſpeak not of myſelf; but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doth the works: believe me, that I am in the Father, and the Father in me; or elſe believe me for the very

very work's ſake, ver. 20. At that day ye ſhall know, that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you. Chap. xv. 4. Abide in me, and I in you. Chap. xvii. 11. Holy Father, keep through thine own name, thoſe whom thou haſt given me; that they may be one, as we are; ver. 21. That they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee; that they alſo may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou haſt ſent me. ver. 22. And the glory which thou gaveſt me, I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one. ver. 23. I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one, and that the world may believe that thou haſt ſent me, and haſt loved them, as thou haſt loved me. ver. 26. That the love wherewith thou haſt loved me, may be in them, and I in them. 1 John iii. 24. He that keepeth his commandments, dwelleth in him, and he in him. 1 John iv. 15. Whoſoever ſhall confeſs, that Jeſus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God. And ver. 16. God is love, and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him.

Having thus given what I apprehend, to be a clear and rational interpretation, of this converſation between Chriſt and the Jews, I ſhall now conſider what you have offered, p. 75. *&c.* to ſhew, that Chriſt and the Father are one Being, in oppoſition to the figurative ſenſe I have contended for, from the ſcope of the diſcourſe and parallel expreſſions.

I ſhall diſmiſs your miſrepreſentation of my paraphraſe of theſe words, *I and my Father are One*, and proceed to examine your reaſons, why you think it not right. You obſerve, "that our Saviour argues from his works, which yet he did

in

in his Father's name, that is, by his eſpecial and immediate appointment, that he is the Chriſt whom the Jews enquired about. Now, either Chriſt actually hath in himſelf the power of doing the works, or he hath not: but if he hath not, he is then here guilty of a moſt falſe preſumption. For by declaring his power, To give unto his ſheep eternal life, and that they ſhall never periſh out of his hand; he aſſumes to himſelf a power, which the Jews muſt know to be the power of God alone: to ſhew the truth of his aſſertion, he tells them, That his Father who gave him theſe ſheep, is the God whom they acknowledge to be greater than all, and out of whoſe hand they muſt conſequently own none to be able to pluck them; but I affirm, ſays he, I and my Father (the God whom you own), are one, and the conſequence he leaves them to draw, is evidently this; and therefore none ſhall be able to pluck them out of my hand. Now, if the words of Chriſt, *I and my Father are One*, are not to be underſtood in the ſtrict and literal ſenſe, making Chriſt and his Father, eſſentially, and truly, one Being; his declaration, whereby he abſolutely aſſerts, that no perſon whatſoever, ſhall be able to pluck the ſheep out of his hand, is a plain preſumptuous falſhood. Becauſe, if Chriſt and the Father are not one Being; Chriſt muſt be then, what you contend for, a meer creature; and therefore, it cannot be abſolutely true, that none is able to pluck them out of his hand: for then the Father being in every reſpect ſuperior to Chriſt, muſt be more than able to do it. But, perhaps, you will ſay, that though the Father be able, yet he will not do it. But what aſſurance can Chriſt himſelf have in this caſe, that he will not do it? Chriſt, upon your ſuppoſition,

ſition, is but a meer creature: and therefore, though he be allowed to be the higheſt, and moſt perfect of all creatures, yet ſtill there is a poſſibility of his ſwerving from the will of God: which if it ſhould happen, God would certainly diſplace him from his office. And therefore, our Saviour's poſitive declaration, is a plain and moſt falſe preſumption, as it ſuppoſes a thing to be abſolutely impoſſible, which can be only allowed conditionally. And though the Father be ſaid to be greater than all, yet Chriſt's declaration of his power to protect his ſheep, is as ſtrong as what is ſaid of the Father, and conſequently, Chriſt's power muſt be the ſame with, or equal to, the Father's. But certainly, there is but one infinite power; and if the power be the ſame, and conſequently undivided; the Nature, or Eſſence, of theſe two Perſons, in which it is lodged, muſt be the ſame and undivided: and as there cannot be two infinite Beings, theſe two Perſons muſt make but one infinite, one all-powerful Being; and therefore the words, *I and my Father are One*, ſtrictly, and literally true." Pages 75—78.

Anſ. That Chriſt appealed to his miraculous works, for the truth of his pretenſions, is very evident; and it is no leſs evident, that all the power which he demonſtrated in the performance of miracles, was derived from his God and Father, as he himſelf hath ſolemnly aſſured us upon repeated occaſions. Neither was our Lord guilty of a falſe preſumption, as you prophanely ſpeak, by aſſerting that none can pluck the ſheep out of his hand, as he was infallibly aſſured, according to his own expreſs declaration, that the Father had given them into his hands, and conſequently, they were as ſafe under his protection as the Father's, who

who had particularly committed the care of them to the Son. As to your obſervation, that if Chriſt and the Father be not one Being, our Saviour was guilty of a preſumptuous falſhood in aſſerting, that *none* could pluck the ſheep out of his hand, becauſe the Father being in every reſpect ſuperior to Chriſt, muſt be more than able to do it; common ſenſe plainly tells us, that the term *none*, can have no poſſible relation to the Father, who is greater than *all*, and therefore, he muſt neceſſarily be excepted, who *gave* the ſheep into his hands, and likewiſe the power to protect them. Again, with reſpect to your next obſervation, you are guilty of a criminal preſumption, to call in queſtion the ſtrict virtue of Chriſt, who had always obeyed the will of God without any deviation. Beſides, if this argument has any weight, namely, the poſſibility of Chriſt's departing from the will of God, if a free and inferior Being; we can never abſolutely depend upon any favour from Almighty God, unleſs immediately diſpenſed by himſelf: if he employs an inferior agent for the benefit of his creatures, with the ſtrongeſt credentials, it is ſtill poſſible he may deceive them, as being a free and imperfect being. The Children of Iſrael could not be aſſured, that Moſes was a perſon commiſſioned by God, to deliver them from the land of Egypt, though he proved his commiſſion by miraculous works, becauſe it was ſtill poſſible, as he was a free creature, he might deviate from the will of God, and be diſplaced from the office. As to your next obſervation, I anſwer, that Chriſt muſt be poſſeſſed of a power equal to the commiſſion he has received of protecting the ſheep, is readily granted: but to infer from hence, that his power is equal to the

Father's

Father's in all reſpects, and conſequently, that he has the ſame Eſſence with the Father, is abſolutely inconſiſtent with common ſenſe, which muſt convince every unprejudiced perſon, that the perſon who gives a power, is greater than he who receives it. The very ſame argument will equally prove, that Angels, Moſes, Prophets and Apoſtles, becauſe they have received power from God to execute important offices, have the ſame undivided power, and conſequently the ſame Eſſence with the Father. The reaſon expreſsly aſſigned, why none is able to pluck the ſheep out of the hands of the Son, is becauſe the Father which gave them is greater than all, and none is able to pluck them out of his Father's hand. What can be a more rational ſenſe, than that Chriſt, though an inferior being, might be abſolutely aſſured of a point, namely, the protection of true Chriſtians, for which he had the expreſs authority of the ſupreme Lord of all?

With regard to the texts produced in the Appeal, and in this treatiſe, it appears that the union of the Apoſtles with one another, and with the Son, and with the Father alſo, is deſcribed by our Lord with the ſame expreſſions, as the union between himſelf and the Father: and, conſequently, if this expreſſion, *I and my Father are One*, neceſſarily proves the Son to be one in Eſſence with, and equal to, the Father; the ſame form of expreſſion in the 17th chapter, will equally prove that the Apoſtles are one in Eſſence with, and equal to, the Son, and ſo have one Eſſence with the Father. But you contend (and ſo indeed you are neceſſarily obliged, otherwiſe your cauſe is gone for ever) that the union between the Father and Son, muſt be interpreted of metaphyſical Eſſence, or Sub-

ſtance, becauſe the Son is ſaid to have been in the beginning (that is, from all eternity) with God; that he is ſtiled God; that the world was made by him, and to him owes its preſervation. Now remarkable it is, that in all thoſe parts of Scripture, where our Saviour is deſcribed in the higheſt ſtrain, with reſpect to titles and attributes, it is never ſaid that Chriſt and the Father are one, ſo that your producing theſe paſſages (which I have plainly ſhewn in the courſe of the debate, to be perfectly conſiſtent with the unity, and ſupremacy of God the Father) prove nothing in relation to the union you contend for. Neither would there be any propriety in our Saviour's compariſon, if the union of Father and Son be interpreted in the ſenſe of Eſſence, when the union of Chriſt and his members, neceſſarily denotes a figurative and ſpiritual union. Holy Father, keep through thine own name thoſe whom thou haſt given me, that they may be one as we are. ver. 11. That they all may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they alſo may be one in us. ver. 21. That is, that my Diſciples may be united in love to each other, and in obedience to thee, as I enjoy thy love and favour by a ſtrict obedience to thy holy will. This I apprehend to be a clear, rational, and conſiſtent ſenſe. But what ſenſe would there be in Chriſt's praying to his Father, that his Diſciples would be united with him and the Father, as the Father and Son are ſtrictly one in metaphyſical Eſſence? There muſt be ſuppoſed ſome general likeneſs between the union of Chriſt with the Father, and the ſpiritual union between Chriſt and his members; otherwiſe, the compariſon would not have been made at all. Doubtleſs the former, is more glorious than the latter, as Chriſt was always

ways obedient to his Father's will, and the beſt Chriſtians cannot be ſaid to have been abſolutely faithful at all times: but metaphyſical Eſſence, has no ſort of relation to this point; neither could the Diſciples have the leaſt notion of any ſuch ſenſe, it being indeed a ſenſe that never exiſted in the minds of men, till ſeveral hundred years after the days of the Apoſtles.

Again, you endeavour to "prove the neceſſary and eſſential union between the Father and Son, from John xiv. 10. where Chriſt declares, *The Father that dwelleth in me, he doth the works*, which otherwiſe he doth, and aſcribes to himſelf, from whence he argues their immediate and neceſſary union, *Believe me, that I am in the Father, and the Father in me: or elſe, believe me for the very works ſake*, ver. 11."

Anſ. As Chriſt performed his miraculous works, by virtue of a power derived from the Father, it may be properly ſaid, that the Father performed the works; and likewiſe it may be juſtly ſaid, that Chriſt performed them, becauſe he was the immediate inſtrument whom God employed. Let the parallel expreſſions produced above, and particularly the 20th ver. of chap. xiv. be conſidered, and the ſenſe you contend for, will appear forced and unnatural. *At that day ye ſhall know that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you.* As God dwelt in Chriſt, ſo Chriſt dwelt in the Apoſtles; they received a power from Chriſt to work miracles, and an authority to preach his Goſpel, in like manner as the Father imparted to the Son a power of working miracles, and an authority to reveal his will. As certain, as Chriſt and his Apoſtles are different beings, though Chriſt is ſaid to be in them, and they in Chriſt; ſo certain is it,

that the Father and Chriſt are different beings, though it be ſaid that the Father is in Chriſt, and Chriſt in the Father. The ſacred writers were abſolute ſtrangers to the notion of metaphyſical, or eſſential union.

But to return to the inſtances you have produced of the title, God, being given to Chriſt. 1 John i. 5. *God is Light.* "You labour to prove, that God in this text, either ſignifies Chriſt; or admitting that it ſignifies the Father, yet as there is, or can be, but one true Light, and both Father and Son, being declared to be this Light, they both muſt therefore make but one Light, one Being, and conſequently, but one God." Pages 55, 56.

Anſ. It is true, God is ſtiled Light, and Chriſt is ſtiled the Light of the World. But nothing can be more fallacious than to argue from hence, that God, and Chriſt, are one Being, one God. God is uſually deſcribed in Scripture, with the ſame titles and attributes that are applied to inferior beings, in order to give mankind, a more familiar and clear notion of his perfections. The very ame argument will equally prove, that the Apoſtles make one being with God, becauſe they are expreſsly ſtiled, *The Light of the World.* Matth. v. 14. *God is Light*, Chriſt is ſtiled the Light of Men, and the Apoſtles are ſtiled the Light of the World. But ſurely, common ſenſe can tell us, that God muſt be ſtiled Light, in an higher and more eminent ſenſe than Chriſt, and Chriſt than the Apoſtles. When the one ſupreme God is ſtiled Light, we ſhould conſider him, as the only original ſource of all true Light, Knowledge, and Purity, without the leaſt mixture of Darkneſs, Ignorance, or Impurity: Chriſt is called Light,

becauſe

becauſe *he was ſent by the Father*, to reveal his will to mankind; and the Apoſtles are called Light, becauſe they were employed by Chriſt, to preach his Goſpel to the world.

But you obſerve, "That it is more than probable, that the word, God, in this part of St. John's Epiſtle, refers neither to the Father, nor the Son ſeperately, but to both together, for ver. 3. he ſays, *our fellowſhip is with the Father, and with his Son Jeſus Chriſt*. And ver. 5, 6 it is declared, *that God is Light*, &c. *If we ſay that we have fellowſhip with him, and walk in darkneſs, we lie, and do not the truth*. Fellowſhip with *him*, which refers to God in the foregoing verſe, is yet ver. 3. particularly ſpecified to be a fellowſhip with the Father and the Son. The word, God, therefore, ver. 5. to which the relative-pronoun *him*, ver. 6. refers, muſt comprehend both Father and Son: otherwiſe, it ſhould ſeem that Chriſtians are not qualified, to receive the benefit of being cleanſed from all ſin, it being an eſſential part, that they ſhould have fellowſhip with the Son, as well as the Father. But beſides, the ſame Apoſtle ſays, in his Goſpel, chap. i. 4. That in him was Life, and this Life was the Light of Men: and then ver. 9. he was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world; that is, the light of nature, or reaſon, which every man is naturally endued with, proceedeth from him; which, I believe, you will own to be the peculiar gift of God." Pages 56, 57.

Anſ. It is very abſurd to interpret the word, God, in this particular paſſage, as denoting Father and Son, in oppoſition to the whole tenour of Scripture, there being no text in the New Teſtament, where the word, God, ſignifies more perſons than

one: particularly, it neceſſarily ſignifies in this place, the Father only. Let the 5th, 6th, and 7th verſes, be compared together; *God* is Light, and in *him* is no darkneſs. —— Fellowſhip with *him*. —— As *he* is in the Light —— the blood of Jeſus Chriſt *his* Son cleanſeth us, from all ſin. *Him*, *he*, and *his*, neceſſarily refer to God, and conſequently, God muſt be the Father, according to your own rule, already laid down, as Chriſt is expreſly ſtiled *his* Son. Your obſervation to prove the contrary, muſt appear to have no weight, if it be conſidered, that fellowſhip with each other, with the Father, and with his Son Jeſus Chriſt, is mentioned, ver. 3. Fellowſhip with the Father only, is mentioned ver. 6. it being not neceſſary, to repeat again fellowſhip with the Son, for fellowſhip with the Father, neceſſarily implies it with the Son, to real Chriſtians. When the Apoſtle deſcribes the qualifications, of having fellowſhip with the Father, and with the Son, and with each other, ver. 7. it is obſervable, that he takes notice of the latter only, namely, fellowſhip with each other, though fellowſhip with the Father and Son muſt be deemed of more importance. In what ſenſe our Saviour is ſtiled Light, I have explained above; from whence it is moſt probable, that when he is called the *true Light, that lighteth every man that cometh into the world*, this deſcription refers to the light of the Goſpel, whereby life and immortality are brought to light, and not to that reaſon, which every man is naturally endued with.

As to your next obſervation, relating to *eternal life*, 1 John i. 2. *which was with the Father*, from which you infer Chriſt to be ſtrictly eternal, and

God

God in the higheſt ſenſe, I have given an anſwer above. See Pages 57—59.

John xx. 28. Here you aſk, "doth not St. Thomas expreſly call Chriſt, his God and his Lord? And is there any more than one Lord, or God? Had Chriſt a different God from St. Thomas? As God is Chriſt's Father in a quite different ſenſe, from that in which he is the Father of his faithful creatures; and by being thus his Father, hath communicated his own nature to him, whence he is God equally with him; ſo with regard to his human nature only, the Father is repreſented as his God, in the ſame manner, that he is by right of creation, the God of the whole univerſe: and yet by force of the ſame right, and upon account of his divine nature, the Son with the Father, is the one ſupreme God alſo." Page 57.

Anſ. I have already obviated this, in the courſe of the debate, and have ſhewn the infinite abſurdity, of ſuppoſing the Father of Chriſt, to be a different being, from the Father of all creatures, the former, according to your account, being one perſon, and the latter, a being, conſiſting of three perſons. Our Saviour, as obſerved in the Appeal, p. 37. 2d edit. declares after his reſurrection, *I aſcend unto my Father, and your Father, to my God, and your God*; and conſequently, he profeſſes himſelf inferior to his God and Father, if words be interpreted by common ſenſe: but it requires a very nice and ſubtle diſtinction, to interpret *my God*, with reſpect to the human nature of Chriſt, as diſtinguiſhed from his divine; which goes upon the ſuppoſition, that the Athanaſian account of Chriſt's human and divine nature, is a Scripture doctrine, of which it is abſolutely impoſſible,

that Mary Magdalene, to whom the words were ſpoke, ſhould have any ſort of notion: neither does it appear, that the Apoſtles have ſet forth in their writings, any ſuch opinion. *My Father, and your Father, my God, and your God*, certainly mean the ſame perſon, and conſequently, Chriſt and Thomas, had the ſame one ſupreme God, and Lord; from whence it undeniably follows, that Thomas's words, my God and my Lord, if applied to Chriſt, muſt mean a perſon, ſtiled God and Lord, in the inferior ſenſe. But upon a ſerious review of the whole affair, it appears extremely probable, that theſe words were not applied to Chriſt. The faith expreſsly required of Thomas, was the belief of Chriſt's reſurrection: this is evident from the context. Chriſt, upon his appearance to Thomas after his reſurrection, ſaith unto him, reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thruſt into my ſide, and be not faithleſs, but believing, namely, that I am riſen from the dead.—And, when Thomas, upon his conviction, had uttered theſe words, *My Lord, and my God, Jeſus* ſaith unto him, *Thomas, becauſe thou haſt ſeen me, thou haſt believed*; which plainly ſhews, that he believed only what he had ſeen, namely, that Jeſus appeared by the marks of his body, to be the ſame perſon who was crucified: but as to his being his Lord and God, that could not be the object of his bodily eyes; and therefore the words may be juſtly underſtood, as a ſudden exclamation, My Lord, and my God, how great is thy power! It may not be improper, to caſt your eye upon the laſt verſe of this chapter, where you will find St. John plainly declaring, what was his main deſign in writing his Goſpel. *But theſe are written,*

ten, namely, theſe ſigns and wonders, *that ye might believe, that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Son of God, and that believing, ye might have life through his name.* If we will take St. John's word, he had no deſign to tranſmit in writing, the opinion you contend for, that the Son with the Father, is the one ſupreme God, or that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are one God; but expreſsly aſſures us, that it is ſufficient for all the purpoſes of neceſſary belief, if we profeſs faith in Chriſt, as the Son of God.

You proceed to obſerve, "that Chriſt is in the words of the Pſalmiſt, applied by St. Paul, Heb. i. 8. called God. And the reaſon of this is plain: for the words of the Pſalmiſt, do here plainly refer to his future exiſtence in human nature; as is evident from his alluſion, to his unction by the Holy Spirit, after his incarnation, and by that unction being preferred before his fellows, the reſt of the ſons of men. Remember ſtill, Sir, that to us there is but one God."

Anſ. It undeniably appears, from the whole ſcope of this chapter, that the Apoſtle's profeſſed view was to prove, that Chriſt was made ſuperior to the Angels, upon account of his greater virtue and obedience; which muſt neceſſarily refer to his higheſt ſtate after his reſurrection: for the ſame Apoſtle expreſsly declares, that during his ſtate of humiliation, he was made lower than the Angels; and conſequently, as he is repreſented inferior to his God and Father, in his higheſt ſtate, ver. 9. the groundleſs notion of the diſtinction of the human and divine nature, can have no place in this particular paſſage, which has forced you to the expedient, of making our Saviour preferred before his fellows, the reſt of the ſons of men, with reſpect

reſpect to his exiſtence in human nature, in direct contradiction to the eye-ſight of the moſt careleſs reader of this chapter; his preference to angels as his fellows, being plainly intended by the apoſtle, ſee verſe 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. You remind me that to us there is but one God. You ſhould have added, the Father, which grand and important truth is deeply imprinted upon my ſoul, and hope I ſhall be enabled to profeſs it upon all proper occaſions; and could wiſh you would not employ your pains and learning to darken this fundamental principle of natural and revealed religion. I can maintain the doctrine of one ſupreme God and Father of all conſiſtently with the acknowledgment of Chriſt being a God in an inferior ſenſe, according to the expreſs determination of Scripture, and particularly this very chapter.

Rom. ix. 5. Upon this text you obſerve, that there is not the leaſt pretence, or cauſe of ſuſpicion for a different reading in the original text; and that it is not capable of ambiguity, but is directly applied to Chriſt.

Anſ. As to the firſt, I refer the curious reader to Mr. Whiſton's treatiſe, entitled, Athanaſian Forgeries, Impoſitions, and Interpolations, p. 6, ——12. and to Mr. Jackſon's Chriſtian Liberty aſſerted, &c. p. 94,——103. both printed for Noon. With reſpect to the ſecond, namely, the ambiguity of the text, Mr. Locke, Mr. Jackſon, and other learned men, beſides Dr. Clarke, have acknowledged it. When a text is of ambiguous conſtruction, the ſenſe muſt be determined by the uſual ſtile of the ſacred writer; his profeſſed doctrine in other plain declarations, the general deſign of the context, and the main tenor of the New Teſtament. I humbly preſume that if St. Paul

Paul had meant theſe words of Chriſt, he would have ſaid (ὁ ἐϛιν ἐπι πανϖων,) agreeably to a parallel expreſſion, Rom. i. 25. (παρα τον κτισαντα, * ὁ ἐϛιν ευλογητὸ εις τους αιωνας) admitting the order of the words as they now ſtand, it ſhould ſeem that the apoſtle intended to offer up a doxology to God on account of the privileges of the Jews. But the more I conſider the words and context, the more I am convinced of the reading taken notice of in the Appeal; *of whom as concerning the fleſh is Chriſt, who is the God over all bleſſed for ever.* This reading indeed, as I owned, 2d edit. p. 38. ſuppoſes the tranſpoſition of one ſingle letter, (ων ο inſtead ο ων) which the learned well know might eaſily happen by the careleſsneſs of a tranſcriber. With reſpect to my arguing in the Appeal from the profeſſed deſign of the apoſtle in favour of the reading I contend for, you obſerve, that *the reaſon* given in the Appeal for the apoſtle's ſpeaking in as high a ſtrain as poſſible of his countrymen, doth *not at all appear.* I anſwer, let the ſcope of the 9th and 10th chap. be carefully conſidered, and it will appear plain to an attentive reader, that the profeſſed ſubject of it was God's rejection of the Jewiſh people as a nation, and the taking the Gentiles as his people. Nothing therefore could be better adapted to the apoſtle's purpoſe, than to expreſs his tender regards for his unhappy countrymen; that he did not deliver this doctrine out of any prejudice to his brethren, but rather it was matter of lamentation that a people ſo highly favoured with extraordinary privileges, ſhould fall from ſo glori-

* St. Paul uſually makes uſe of the relative ὁ, when he refers to an immediate antecedent, which manifeſtly appears from this and the foregoing verſe.

ous a ſtate. The mention of theſe privileges was very natural upon this ſtriking occaſion, and certain it is that they are all reckoned up, excepting the grand privilege of all, according to the common interpretation. But it ſeems to me ſcarce credible, that St. Paul ſhould omit that very privilege, namely, their relation to God as their God, in which they chiefly gloried. chap. ii. 17. as being the grand article of the covenant made with Abraham; and therefore I ſhall always conſider the text as running thus, (ων η υιοθεσια, &c. ων οι πατερες, και εξ ων ο Χριστος, το κατα σαρκα, ων ο επι παντων θεος ευλογητος εις τους αιωνας) whoſe is the adoption, &c. whoſe are the Fathers, and of whom as concerning the fleſh is Chriſt, whoſe is the God over all bleſſed for ever. Fathers, Chriſt, God, appear with the utmoſt propriety. As to the tenor of the New Teſtament, it is evident that neither St. Paul, nor any of the apoſtles do aſcribe to Chriſt the title of God over all, or the bleſſed God; on the contrary, it is a title conſtantly appropriated to the Father. See paſſages in the Appeal, p. 33. 2d edit. You obſerve, "that if this was intended only in honour of the Jews; ſurely his ſaying that Chriſt, who, according to the Fleſh, was born of them, is God over all bleſſed for ever, muſt carry in it a much higher ſhew of reſpect, than barely ſaying, the God over all is their God. This they pretended to know already, and arrogantly prided themſelves upon; nor would they thank the apoſtle for acknowledging it."

Anſ. The queſtion is not, what vain mortals may eſteem an higher ſhew of reſpect, but what the Scripture has determined in the caſe. Beſides, the Jews never entertained this notion of the promiſed Meſſiah, namely, that he was the God over all

all bleſſed for ever: if the apoſtles had preached Chriſt in this capacity, they could not have made one convert; the Jews would have juſtly thought it rank polytheiſm, to own another perſon as ſupreme God, beſides the perſon of the one ſupreme God whom they had always adored. As to your obſervation, that the Jews would not have thanked the apoſtle for acknowledging the grand privilege which they knew already; this may be equally ſaid of the other privileges, for they knew theſe already as well as the grand one of all: and whether they would have thanked the apoſtle for the acknowledgment of any of them or not, they would have certainly taken it amiſs, if St. Paul profeſſing to reckon up the Jewiſh privileges, had omitted the moſt eſſential one of all, upon which, as you are obliged to grant, they valued themſelves. I cannot help judging, notwithſtanding your charge of obſtinacy, that St. Paul, ſo great a maſter of addreſs, cannot be ſuppoſed to have omitted this Jewiſh privilege.

What you advance in the next paragraph, p. 60. has been ſufficiently obviated in the courſe of the Debate.

Acts xx. 28. has been conſidered above.

As to 1 Tim. iii. 16. I expreſſed myſelf doubtfully, whether *God*, *who*, or *which* was right. Upon this you obſerve, "that the preſent reading is the true one, the learned Biſhop Pearſon having undeniably proved it, and clearly obviated every pretence of any other word's being ſubſtituted here inſtead of, God." p. 60, 61.

Anſ. Since the publication of the Appeal, there has appeared a very curious diſſertation of the great Sir Iſaac Newton upon this very text; wherein he has made it at leaſt highly probable, that the word

God

God is a corruption inſerted in the room of *which*, referring to myſtery, as it is ſtill preſerved in the Latin verſions, and ſome Greek manuſcripts of the New Teſtament. This extraordinary perſon has alledged a very remarkable fact (of which not one learned perſon in Europe was a better judge, becauſe he was converſant in all the writings of that time) namely, that this text was never produced by Greek or Latin writers for five centuries to prove the deity of Chriſt; that it was never quoted during all the time of the Arian controverſy, which certainly would have frequently happened, if they had read the words thus, *God was manifeſt in the fleſh.* This text indeed was ſometimes quoted upon other occaſions, but the reading was always, *which*, (*o*) and not *God.* The ſame eminent author has pointed out the cauſe of this corruption of the text, the time when, and the perſon by whom, it was corrupted. I refer the curious reader to this diſſertation of Sir Iſaac Newton, (ſee his two letters to Mr. Le Clerc printed for Payne 1754), where he will find every thing advanced in Biſhop Pearſon's learned note (p. 128. edit. eleventh) fully and clearly obviated.

1 John v. 20. In the Appeal I obſerved, that the title of true God is naturally referred to the Father: on the other hand, you earneſtly contend that in this text it is applied to Chriſt. Let the reaſons on both ſides be conſidered. You obſerve "that the apoſtle, chap. i. 2. deſcribes Chriſt as *the Life*, and, *the eternal Life*, *which was with the Father.* And again, ver. 11, 12, 13. of this chap. life, and eternal life, is particularly aſcribed to him, and to be in him. Let his Goſpel be conſulted, chap. i. 4. chap. v. 26. chap. xi. 25. chap. xvii.

xvii. 3. The Father is never directly ſtiled eternal Life, this being the peculiar title of the Son. As therefore eternal Life means the Son, the true God denotes the ſame perſon with which it is joined in the ſame ſentence." p. 61.

Anſ. That Chriſt in this epiſtle is peculiarly ſtiled eternal Life, and that in other paſſages of Scripture as well as this epiſtle, eternal life is ſaid to be diſpenſed through him, is very true, and readily acknowledged; but this proves ſomething in direct oppoſition to your purpoſe. St. John never declares that the true God is eternal life; but the reaſon why Chriſt is ſtiled eternal Life is, becauſe he is the perſon who has brought us to the acknowledgment of the true God. He (namely, the Son of God) hath given us an underſtanding (as it is expreſſed in this very verſe) that we may know whom? why ſurely the true God: therefore the ſenſe of theſe words, *this is the true God and eternal life*, muſt be evidently to this effect: this God whom the Son has given us an underſtanding to know, is the true God, and to know him in or by his Son, this is eternal life, agreeably to the ſolemn determination of Chriſt himſelf: *this is life eternal to know thee*, namely, the Father, *to be the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent.* This is having the Father and the Son, 2 John. 9. Chriſt is the way, the truth, and the life, by giving us an underſtanding to know the true God. The ſentiment of St. Peter is exactly the ſame, though expreſſed in a way ſomething different. 1 Pet. i. 20, 21. *who*, (namely Chriſt) *verily was fore-ordained——for you; who by, or through him, do believe in God that raiſed him up from the dead, that your faith and hope might be in God.* The chriſ-

chriſtians, to whom St. Peter wrote, are required to conſider Chriſt as the perſon, through whom they were brought to the acknowledgment of God; and conſequently, God is plainly ſet forth as the grand and ultimate object of their belief, and the chief merit of Chriſt conſiſts in being the inſtrument of this important point.

Your next obſervation is, "that if *this* referred to the true God, or him that is true, the remote antecedent, and not to the immediate one Jeſus Chriſt, the propoſition itſelf would be trifling and inſignificant, as being merely a repetition of what was expreſſed before in the ſame verſe."

Anſ. The laſt words are evidently not a repetition, but a recapitulation of what was expreſſed before. Chriſt is repreſented as the perſon who came into the world to enlighten our underſtandings, with regard to the grand object of our faith and worſhip, the one true God whom we know through Chriſt. The apoſtle then very pertinently ſums up in ſhort what he had expreſſed before, as being a point of great importance. *This is the true God* to the acknowledgment of whom Chriſt hath brought us, and conſequently, he is the true way to obtain eternal life, as we receive from him the knowledge of the true God, on whom eternal life certainly depends. When the caſe is conſidered in this view, it is impoſſible to ſuppoſe, that the true God, namely, the Father the principal ſubject, ſhould be omitted in the recapitulation. As I obſerved in the Appeal, if *this* refers to Chriſt, he is ſtiled the true God, and the Son of the true God in the ſame verſe. Add to this, that the title of true God is always applied to the Father in other paſſages: John xvii. 3. quoted above; and

1 Theſſ. i. 9. *to ſerve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven* *.

Upon the whole, let your interpretation and mine be compared together: yours ſtands thus: "we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an underſtanding to know him that is true (or, the true God) and we are in him that is (alſo) true (that is) in his Son Jeſus Chriſt; (for) this (Jeſus Chriſt alſo, being one with the Father) is the true God and eternal life." On the other hand, this is mine; we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an underſtanding that we may know him that is true, namely, the true God, and we are in the true God by Jeſus Chriſt (or, we are in his true Son Jeſus Chriſt). This is the true God whom the Son of God hath given us an underſtanding to know; and to be in him in (or

* You obſerve, that the particle, *in*, according to my interpretation, ſignifies *in*, in the firſt place, and *by*, or *through*, in the ſecond, which ſeems improbable in the ſame verſe. To which it may be juſtly anſwered, that the following inſtances undeniably prove the ſame uſe of the particle *in*, Acts xvii. 31. *In righteouſneſs by that man*; here the ſame particle (εν) *in* is uſed for *in*, and *by*, in the ſame verſe: ſee likewiſe Epheſ. iii. 21. 2 Theſſ. i. 4. 1 John iv. 9. and ſo likewiſe in the preſent text, εν τω αληθινω εν τω υιω αυτου, in the true one by his Son. Again, you obſerve that the manuſcripts which read *the true God*, inſtead of, *him that is true*, omit the repetition of this particle; plainly thereby making the words, his Son Jeſus Chriſt, explanatory of the immediately foregoing words, *him that is true*; and conſequently determining the latter to mean, as they really do, no other perſon but Jeſus Chriſt. *Anſ.* It is allowed that ſome copies omit εν τω in the ſecond place; but what follows from hence? why, then the ſtrict interpretation of the Greek words muſt be this, (εν τω αληθινω υιω αυτου ιησου χριστω); and we are in his true Son Jeſus Chriſt, namely, the Son of the true God mentioned juſt before, and to whom, *his* neceſſarily refers; which is parallel to thoſe paſſages, where Chriſt is ſaid to be in his diſciples, and his diſciples in him.

by) his Son, this is eternal life. Thus ver. 11. of this chap. This is the record that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in (by, or through) his Son. Your interpretation ſeems to my underſtanding groſs confuſion, eſpecially when compared with your avowed principles in other paſſages: by the word, *God*, in the firſt ſentence of the verſe, you mean the perſon of the Father; *(Son of God) him that is true*, or *the true God* in the next ſentence means, according to your profeſſed diſtinction in ſeveral parts of your anſwer, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; again, *true God* in the laſt ſentence means the perſon of the Son, being one with the Father. It is indeed impoſſible to defend the Athanaſian doctrine, without infinitely abſurd interpretations of holy Scripture.

You thus go on: "the following queſtion, (namely, how God can be one, if other beings, more particularly Chriſt, may be juſtly called Gods? Appeal, p. 40. 2d edit.) ſuppoſes a diſtinction not true in fact; a diſtinction between the true God as ſupreme, and inferior beings actually allowed to be Gods. Whereas the apoſtle, Gal. iv. 8. affirms them to be by nature no Gods: and plainly gives us to underſtand the ſame, Rom. i. 25. of every creature of however ſo high a rank, or degree, to whom divine worſhip hath been impiouſly given by men. God therefore is called ſupreme (by men indeed, unwarranted by ſcripture language) not with regard to inferior Gods, who have no being, as ſuch, in nature, but with regard to his ſupreme ſovereignty over the whole univerſe. And he is alſo called the one, or only God, not comparatively with regard to thoſe beings improperly, or falſely ſo called; but abſolutely and excluſively of the pretenſions of any other being to that cha-

racter: but Chriſt the Son is called God in as high and as abſolute a ſenſe as the Father, unleſs we abſurdly ſuppoſe the ſame word in the ſame ſentence, John i. 1. to mean without the leaſt intimation of any ſolid reaſon, two infinitely different ideas, at the ſame time: and you allow a proportionable worſhip paid to the Son. But God in the firſt commandment, and frequently elſewhere, hath abſolutely excluded the belief of any other God beſides himſelf.——And Chriſt himſelf adopts the words of Moſes, and declares, Mark xii. 29. Hear, O Iſrael, the Lord our God, is one Lord, thereby abſolutely excluding not only all other gods, but all other lords. Can there then any warrant of the one ſupreme God, be hence collected for our allowing the character of an inferior God to any being? Does the New Teſtament imply any ſuch thing? if not, and yet Chriſt is repreſented as God and one with the Father, and divine worſhip is aſcribed to him, we muſt unavoidably, to preſerve the unity of God ſo ſtrongly inculcated, believe him to be with the Father, the one ſupreme God." p. 63, 64.

Anſ. My queſtion naturally ariſes from a plain ſcripture fact, Moſes, Angels, and Chriſt being called Gods, and conſequently muſt be allowed to be juſtly ſo ſtiled; and at the ſame time it is very conſiſtently maintained by the ſacred writers, that there is but one God the Father, which muſt neceſſarily ſignify the chief or ſupreme God; (ſupreme is the true import of *almighty*, (παντοκρατορ) and of *the moſt High*, and ſo a ſcripture expreſſion) and conſequently God is ſtiled ſupreme, not only upon account of his ſovereignty over the univerſe, but likewiſe comparatively with regard to inferior beings who have been ſtiled Gods. Is he not called

the *God of Gods*, and *Lord of Lords?* and does not St. Paul declare, that *tho' there are Gods many, yet to us there is but one God the Father?* You have the misfortune to be frequently answered by plain ſcripture expreſſions. As to Galat. iv. 8. St. Paul is ſpeaking to heathen converts, who had worſhipped gods who never exiſted in nature. But what relation has this to Chriſt, who actually received power and dominion from the one ſupreme God? So likewiſe Rom. i. 25. the apoſtle is expreſly ſetting forth the idolatry of the Romans, who *ſerved the creature more than the Creator.* But how does this prove, that Chriſt, though inferior to God, muſt be excluded from all worſhip, when we find it a plain matter of fact that God himſelf hath appointed Chriſt to be worſhipped as Mediator? But this point ſhall be more particularly explained in its proper place. Our Lord has juſtly adopted the ſolemn words of Moſes, Mark xii. 29. *Hear, O Iſrael, the Lord our God is one Lord*; which declaration neceſſarily implies, that there is but one ſupreme God and Lord, with which the higheſt titles and attributes given to Chriſt, are perfectly conſiſtent: he is a God and a Lord, but moſt certainly in an inferior ſenſe, if the determination of Chriſt himſelf and the apoſtles be of any weight. The former has expreſsly maintained the notion of an inferior God; and the latter have aſſured us, that *God made him Lord:* ſo that the unity of God, which I agree with you is ſtrongly and frequently inculcated, ſtands upon a ſolid foundation, though Chriſt is ſtiled a God and Lord; and the worſhip aſcribed to him, is declared to be to the glory of God the Father, as ſhall be more particularly explained under the article of worſhip. The firſt commandment, *Thou ſhalt have no other gods but me,*

me, neceſſarily excludes any perſon or being from being God in as high a ſenſe as the perſon, who there profeſſes himſelf the one only God; but this is conſiſtent, according to Scripture, with the title of God being aſcribed to other perſons, and particularly Chriſt, in an inferior ſenſe. I muſt remind you of the groſs abſurdity of ſuppoſing the word *me* in the firſt commandment to ſignify more perſons than one; *me*, according to your notion, when reduced to plain ſenſe and Engliſh, neceſſarily means *us three*, namely, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. A doctrine that requires this palpably abſurd interpretation, is as certainly falſe as God is true.

It is obſervable, that you have given no anſwer to that plain argument deduced from other inſtances of Scripture to prove, that the one or only God are expreſſions in Scripture, which ſignify the chief or ſupreme God. I commend you for your ſilence; the argument is really unanſwerable. See Appeal, p. 40. 2d edit.

In my comments upon ſome paſſages in the Revelations, I took notice of Alpha and Omega, the firſt and the laſt as a character applied to Chriſt, Revel. i. 11. 17. and offered my reaſons, why this title cannot be underſtood in as high a ſenſe, as when applied to the Father.

Upon this you obſerve, that "no perſon of common ſenſe can conceive two firſts and two laſts." p. 65.

Anſ. Yes certainly, any perſon of common ſenſe may conceive firſt and laſt in different ſenſes, and the context plainly determines an eſſential difference in the application: but pray, Sir, does not your ſcheme neceſſarily imply two firſts and two laſts? for, ſurely, the Father is one perſon, and the Son

is another perſon, who are both ſtiled firſt and laſt, and conſequently, the abſurdity you would fix upon the notion of two firſts and two laſts, falls upon your own hypotheſis; which ſhould induce you for the honour of Scripture to interpret theſe words in a different ſenſe, when applied to the Father and the Son, as, indeed, we are warranted by the paſſages themſelves, and which entirely remove all appearance of abſurdity. I obſerved in the Appeal, that the title of Alpha and Omega, when applied to the Father, muſt be interpreted in an higher ſenſe, than when applied to the Son, becauſe the Father has the additional character of *which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty*, which is never aſcribed to Chriſt. I likewiſe explained the ſenſe, in which Chriſt is ſtiled firſt and laſt, agreeably to the context, and other paſſages of Scripture. See Appeal, 2d edit. p. 41, 42. You have given no anſwer to this plain account of our Saviour's being ſtiled firſt and laſt, drawn from Scripture: but you have laboured very hard to ſhew that the 8th verſe is applied to Chriſt; and it muſt be owned, that you have ſaid ſomething new to prove your point, which ſhall be diſtinctly conſidered.

You obſerve, "that glory is aſcribed to Chriſt after the ſolemn ſalutation to the ſeven churches, which could not be done in derogation to God the Father, and therefore it muſt imply St. John's giving it to the Father as well as Chriſt; and conſequently, Chriſt and the Father, according to the conſtant doctrine of this apoſtle, are one and the ſame." p. 65.

Anſ. That glory is ſometimes aſcribed to our bleſſed Saviour in Scripture, is readily acknowledged, as I have fairly produced in the Appeal

every

every inſtance of it, and particularly this very doxology: but when you infer that the Father and Chriſt are one being, according to the conſtant doctrine of this apoſtle, you infer without the authority of the apoſtle, who never delivered any ſuch doctrine; and the glory aſcribed to Chriſt in this particular inſtance, is expreſsly founded upon his humiliation, and having loved us and waſhed us from our ſins in his own blood, and upon having made us kings and prieſts unto God and his Father: that glory and dominion ſhould be given to the ſupreme Father upon any ſuch account, is abſolutely impoſſible and infinitely abſurd; and to imagine that Chriſt is one and the ſame being with his God and Father, is groſs confuſion, and turns the apoſtle's words into ridicule. You are obliged to own, that Chriſt is not only mentioned diſtinctly from the Father, under a peculiar character, but the diſtinction is ſtill more remarkable, as the ſeven ſpirits are mentioned between the Father and Chriſt; and conſequently, no unprejudiced perſon can poſſibly imagine the Father and Chriſt to be one and the ſame from this deſcription, who are ſo remarkably diſtinguiſhed from each other by peculiar characters. But notwithſtanding all the apoſtle's care to ſecure the ſupremacy of the one God and Father of all, and the diſtinct and inferior characters of the ſeven ſpirits, and Chriſt Jeſus, you have invented an interpretation to make them one being. *Grace be unto you and peace from him which is, and which was, and which is to come.* You interpret *which is*, if I underſtand you rightly, of the Father, *which was*, of Chriſt, and *which is to come*, of Chriſt, and the Holy Spirit. The evidence you produce to ſupport your interpretation is this: "the firſt, namely, *which is*, is

expreſly given by Moſes to Jehovah; the ſecond, namely, *which was*, is given by St. John in his Goſpel, chap. i. 1. and in his firſt epiſtle, chap. i. 2. diſtinctly to the Son; as alſo the third by the ſame apoſtle is aſcribed to Chriſt to point out his character of the expected Meſſias, which was to come into the world: in which laſt alſo is implied the Holy Spirit; who, according to the promiſe of Chriſt, John xiv. 16.—xv. 26.—xvi. 7, 8, 13. was to come to lead his diſciples into all truth." p. 66.

Anſ. The ſalutation according to this ſenſe, will run thus: Grace be unto you and peace from Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; and from the Holy Ghoſt; and from Jeſus Chriſt. Here the Holy Ghoſt and Chriſt are twice mentioned, firſt in the general deſcription, and next particularly by their reſpective characters; whereas the Father is taken no notice of by his peculiar character, and only briefly hinted at by the character of, *which is*, in the general deſcription. If St. John had entertained the ſame notion with you upon this important point, he would certainly have firſt given a general deſcription of the Godhead, as comprehending Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, and then he would have diſtinctly ſpecified each particular perſon by his peculiar character. In order to obviate this you ſay, that the Father is ſufficiently ſpecified by the peculiar name he gives of himſelf to Moſes. *Anſ.* But were not the other two equally ſpecified, according to your ſenſe, by, *was, and is to come?* and therefore there could be no more reaſon to deſcribe the Son and Holy Spirit by their peculiar characters than the Father. That the apoſtle ſhould make ſuch ſlight mention of the ſupreme Father upon this ſolemn occaſion, is impoſſible

poſſible to be conceived, and is really contradicted by the firſt verſe of this chapter, where he gives an account of the perſons immediately concerned in this wonderful prophecy. *The Revelation of Jeſus Chriſt, which God gave unto him, and he ſent and ſignified it by his angel unto his ſervant John.* The ſupreme God and Father of all is the original author of this Revelation, Chriſt is the perſon, to whom the Revelation was communicated by God, and the angel is the perſon employed by Chriſt to communicate it to John. Beſides, *Him which is, and which was, and which is to come*, neceſſarily ſignifies, according to common ſenſe and all the rules of every language I am acquainted with, the ſame one individual perſon. * If theſe words denote three perſons, the uſe of language muſt be deſtroyed; in which caſe a Revelation in writing muſt be uſeleſs, becauſe impoſſible to be underſtood; and conſequently, St. John intended to deſcribe the ſupreme God and Father of all by the character of *him which is, and which was, and which is to come*, remarkably diſtinguiſhed from the ſeven ſpirits, and from Jeſus Chriſt.

Whether this ſolemn deſcription of the Father refers to the character God gave of himſelf to Moſes, or not, 'is far from being certain. The late learned Biſhop Hare has offered conſiderable evidence to ſhew, that *I am that I am* has no relation to the neceſſary exiſtence of the ſupreme Being, as it has been commonly imagined, but was intended to expreſs his peculiar regard for the

* Απο τυ ο ων, ο ην, και ο ερχομενος. If the apoſtle had intended your ſenſe, he would have ſaid, Απο τυ ο ων, και απο τυ ο ην, και απο τυ ο ερχομενος.

an-

anceſtors of the Jewiſh people. See Hare's Prolegomena to his edition of the Hebrew pſalms.

To interpret *was*, by Chriſt upon account of what is ſaid of him, John i. 1. And *is to come*, by Chriſt and the Holy Spirit, becauſe the Meſſias was to come into the world, and the Holy Spirit was promiſed by Chriſt to lead Chriſtians into all truth, has a natural tendency to turn the Scripture into ridicule, and to make any thing of any thing.

You think that verſe 8th, muſt be applied to Chriſt, becauſe the 7th verſe is a deſcription of his ſecond coming, and the laſt words, namely, *which is to come*, naturally refer to this deſcription.

Anſ. Though the 7th verſe, is manifeſtly a deſcription of Chriſt's ſecond coming, yet a full period is concluded with *Amen*, directly contrary to what you would inſinuate, as if the following words were a continuation of the expreſſive *Amen* of Chriſt, *even ſo, Amen.* Now, it is very uncertain, whether theſe words were ſpoke by Chriſt, or not; or admitting they were, the period is fully concluded: whoever, was the ſpeaker, *even ſo, Amen*, was deſigned to ſet forth the certainty of Chriſt's coming, to judgment; then the one ſupreme Almighty Being, is very properly introduced, as ſpeaking in his own perſon, under the lofty character of *which is, which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.* In order to give mankind the ſtrongeſt aſſurance, that this great event will be accompliſhed, as the one ſupreme God, who hath all power in his hands, hath promiſed to make it good. As to the expreſſion, *which is to come*, on which you lay a very great ſtreſs, as referring to Chriſt's ſecond coming, it is meer imagination, without the leaſt evidence to ſupport it.

You

You go on to maintain, "that the title of Lord, which the ſpeaker attributes to himſelf, in the 8th ver. plainly ſhews Chriſt to be the perſon, as he has this title given him, through every part of the New Teſtament."

Anſ. True, Chriſt is frequently ſtiled Lord, but never Lord Almighty, in any other paſſage of the New Teſtament, as you are obliged to grant.

Upon the whole, your expoſition introduces nothing but groſs confuſion, into the 1ſt chap. of Revel. Let it be reviewed: you interpret *which is*, of the Father, *which was*, of the Son, and *which is to come*, of the Son and Holy Ghoſt. ver. 4. Again, you labour to ſhew that the 8th ver. is applied to Chriſt, that is, Chriſt is the perſon *which is, which was, and which is to come.* That this exalted character in the 4th ver. ſhould ſignify three perſons, and in the 8th ver. ſhould ſignify one perſon, is one inſtance of palpable abſurdity, among many others, in which the Athanaſian cauſe is neceſſarily involved; neither is this abſurdity evaded by your obſervation, that "as the three perſons partake of the ſame common nature, the whole deſcription is applicable to all, and each of the perſons." This depends upon the ſuppoſition, that St. John had the ſame notions with you, about the Nature, or Eſſence, of the three Perſons, which is entirely void of the leaſt colour of evidence, St. John having never ſaid one ſyllable, relating to this famous theological diſtinction.

On the other hand, let St. John be his own interpreter, and his ſenſe appears rational and conſiſtent. In the firſt verſe, he gives a clear account of the perſons concerned in this wonderful Revelation; God, Chriſt, an Angel, and St. John; which

which points out the reaſon, why God is ſometimes repreſented, as ſpeaking in his own perſon, ſometimes Chriſt, ſometimes the Angel, and ſometimes John. Ver. 4. He begins his ſalutation to the Churches, with wiſhing all bleſſing from *him, which is, which was, and which is to come*, expreſsly diſtinguiſhed from the ſeven Spirits, and from Chriſt; and conſequently, the Perſon, to whom this grand character is applied, can be no other than God, who gave the Revelation to Chriſt, which character is applied to the Perſon of the Father only, in every other paſſage where it occurs, See chap. iv. 8. xi. 17. xvi. 5. And the term, Almighty, is in Scripture language, always applied to the Father only. It is with utmoſt propriety that God himſelf is introduced in the firſt place, ver. 8. as ſpeaking in his own perſon, in order to eſtabliſh the ſtrongeſt aſſurance, of the important events, contained in this wonderful book.

Before I diſmiſs this article, it is proper to conſider what you have ſaid to ſhew, that the title of Almighty is due to Chriſt, though you own, when Chriſt is particularly mentioned, that it is never applied to him. You refer to "Iſaiah vi. 5. Zechar. xii. 5, 10. as pointing out Chriſt according to the application of St. John xii. 41.—xix. 34, 37. ſo that the Lord of Hoſts is Chriſt. And that the Lord of Hoſts is the ſame with the Lord Almighty, is plain from his alluding to the 3d verſe of the ſame chapter of Iſaiah, in the 8th verſe of the 4th chapter of his revelation, and interpreting the words of the prophet, Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord of Hoſts, into theſe words, Holy, Holy, Holy Lord God Almighty." Page 69.

Anſ. That the Lord of Hoſts, is the ſame perſon with the Lord Almighty, is very true, they being titles peculiar to the one ſupreme God, and never

never applied to Chriſt. But when you infer, from comparing Iſaiah vi. 5. with John xii. 41. that Chriſt is Lord of Hoſts, (admitting the reading in St. John to be right) you draw a concluſion, without any authority from Scripture. The true meaning of Iſaiah compared with St. John, is evidently this: when the Prophet in his viſion, ſaw the glory of God the Father revealing to him the coming of Chriſt, he then ſaw the glory, wherein Chriſt was to be revealed. When the Prophet declares, that *his eyes have ſeen the King, the Lord of Hoſts*, we muſt not imagine that he ſaw the ſupreme Father, *whom no man hath ſeen, or can ſee*, but the Son, or an Angel, repreſenting the perſon of the inviſible Father. Thus it is ſaid of Moſes and the ſeventy elders, Exod. xxiv. 10. that *they ſaw the God of Iſrael:* but we are not to underſtand it, as if they ſaw the inviſible Father, but the Son, or moſt probably an Angel, repreſenting God. To imagine, that St. John intended to repreſent Chriſt as the very Lord of Hoſts, is expreſsly contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture, and contradicted by St. John himſelf in numberleſs texts. Though a good account may be given of the Prophet and Apoſtle compared together, as the text in St. John is commonly read; yet it ought to be obſerved, that Beza's double copy, one of the moſt antient copies in the chriſtian world, with a few more, has it thus; Theſe things ſaid *Eſaias, when he ſaw the glory of God, and ſpake of him.* John xii. 41. —— As to Zechariah xii. 5, 10. compared with John xix. 34, 37. you would infer, that Chriſt is Lord of Hoſts, becauſe, according to a corrupt reading of the Hebrew, the Lord of Hoſts ſpeaks of himſelf, as *being pierced:* in this caſe you ought to have informed your readers, that the true read-

ing of Zechar. xii. 10. is, *they ſhall look* on *him whom they have pierced*, which is eaſily demonſtrated by the citation of St. John himſelf, *They ſhall look upon him whom they pierced*, and is undeniably confirmed by the words of the Prophet immediately following, and *they ſhall mourn for him*, namely, the very perſon whom they pierced *. With reſpect to Iſaiah vi. 3. compared with Revel. iv. 8. it is extremely evident, that the one ſupreme God and Father of all is intended by the Prophet and Apoſtle, whether we conſider the general tenor of Scripture, which has never attributed to Chriſt in his own perſon the character of Lord God Almighty; or whether we regard the expreſs interpretation of St. John, who repreſents the Lord God Almighty as the ſame perſon, who is ſtiled, *which was, and is, and is to come*, which I have already proved is appropriated to the Father; he is likewiſe indiſputably the ſame perſon, *who ſat on the throne, and liveth for ever and ever*, ver. 9. Now in the 5th chapter of Revelation, *the perſon who ſat on the throne*, is plainly and particularly diſtinguiſhed from Jeſus Chriſt, who is deſcribed under the character of a Lamb that was ſlain. Let the 6th, 7th, 13th, and 14th verſes be compared, with the 8th and 9th verſes of the former chapter, and it will appear as bright a truth, as it is poſſible for words to expreſs, that the *Lord God Almighty who ſat on the throne, and liveth for ever and ever*, is the ſupreme Father, it being abſolutely impoſſible that any other perſon, or being, ſhould be intended by St. John, if the moſt ſolemn and cleareſt deſcriptions, have any determinate mean-

* The change of the Hebrew might eaſily happen, as it ſuppoſes the dropping only of one ſingle letter. Beſides, it is cited by the early writers of the church, Look on him.

ing.

ing. Add to this, that the word, God, occurs three times in this 5th chapter, and neceſſarily means the perſon of the Father, ver. 6, 9, 10.

As you have taken it for granted in the courſe of your argument, that the ſeven Spirits before the throne, chap. i. ver. 4. are the Holy Spirit, ſo now you proceed to offer your reaſons for this opinion. Firſt, I will produce my evidence, why I think the ſeven Spirits to be ſeven Angels; and then I will diſtinctly conſider what you have ſaid to prove, that they mean the Holy Ghoſt only.

It is obſervable, that theſe ſeven Spirits are mentioned ſeveral times in this wonderful book, becauſe they are employed in various commiſſions. Let the paſſages be compared: Revel. i. 4. *From the ſeven Spirits which are before his throne.* chap. iii. 1. *Theſe things ſaith he, that hath the ſeven Spirits of God.* chap. iv. 5. *And there were ſeven lamps of fire burning before the throne, which are the ſeven Spirits of God.* chap. v. 6. *In the midſt of the throne —— and in the midſt of the elders ſtood a Lamb as it had been ſlain, having ſeven horns and ſeven eyes, which are the ſeven Spirits of God ſent forth into all the earth.* chap. viii. 2. And *I ſaw the ſeven Angels which ſtood before God.* chap. xv. 5, 6, 7. *And after that I looked, and behold, the temple of the tabernacle of the teſtimony in heaven was opened: and the ſeven Angels came out of the temple —— and one of the four Beaſts gave unto the ſeven Angels.* chap. xvi. 1. And *I heard a great voice out of the temple, ſaying to the ſeven Angels.* chap. xvii. 1. *And there came one of the ſeven Angels, which had the ſeven vials, and talked with me.* chap. xxi. 9. *And there came unto me one of the ſeven Angels which had the ſeven vials full of the ſeven laſt plagues, and talked with me.* From theſe

paſſages

paſſages compared together, it ſeems highly probable, that the ſeven Spirits of God are ſeven Angels. As the ſeven Spirits are repreſented before the throne of God, ſo the ſeven Angels ſtand before God; and the ſeven Angels are likewiſe repreſented as coming out of the temple in heaven, which is another deſcription of the throne of God. Thus Luke i. 19. the angel Gabriel ſpeaks of himſelf, *I am Gabriel that ſtand in the preſence of God*, as the ſeven Spirits, or Angels, are repreſented in Revelation. Thus likewiſe, Tobit xii. 15. the angel Raphael ſpeaks of himſelf, *I am Raphael one of the ſeven holy Angels, which preſent the prayers of the ſaints, and which go in and out before the glory of the Holy One.*

On the other hand, you labour to ſhew, that the ſeven Spirits mean the Holy Ghoſt: in order to prove your point, you maintain that this ſalutation, Revel. i. 4. is a prayer. "You diſtinguiſh prayers into two ſorts, direct and indirect: the Lord's Prayer, with all invocations of this kind, you eſteem of the former ſort; *The grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the love of God, and the fellowſhip of the Holy Ghoſt*, you produce as an inſtance of the latter ſort; to which you add, Gen. xxvii. 28.—xxviii. 3." Page 70.

Anſ. What you call an indirect prayer, cannot with propriety be thought praying at all, which is always directed to the object invoked: whereas indirect prayers, as you ſtile them, are addreſſed to the perſons themſelves, in whoſe behalf the bleſſings are deſired, as you are obliged to grant; which points out an eſſential difference, between a ſolemn and pious wiſh for bleſſings from God, addreſſed to the perſons themſelves, and a prayer directly offered up to God for the obtaining of them.

When

When Iſaac ſays, God give thee of the dew of heaven —— can this be thought of the ſame import, as if he had offered up a prayer to God, namely, I beg of thee, O Lord God, to give a bleſſing to my Son? — It is true, in ſuch a pious wiſh, the divine power is plainly acknowledged; but what I inſiſt upon is, that God himſelf is not directly invoked, and conſequently, it cannot be thought praying to God. We are both agreed, that it is unlawful to pray to Angels, but it may be very proper to wiſh bleſſings from good Angels, becauſe they are employed as miniſters of the chriſtian church. If one Chriſtian ſhould ſay to his Fellow-chriſtians, May the good Angels attend you; can this be thought praying to Angels? which undeniably ſhews the great difference between prayers and ſolemn wiſhes. As therefore I have plainly proved, rhat the ſeven Spirits before the throne, Revel. i. 4. are ſeven Angels, it neceſſarily follows that this ſalutation is not a prayer, but a ſolemn wiſh, the worſhip of Angels being expreſsly forbidden in this very book. From whence it ſeems highly probable, that the ſalutations in the beginning of moſt of the epiſtles, are not prayers, but pious wiſhes of grace and favour from God and Chriſt.

What you urge to prove that theſe ſalutations are prayers, is this: "St. Paul exhorts Timothy in this manner, 1 Tim. ii. 1. *I exhort, therefore, that firſt of all ſupplications, prayers, interceſſions, and giving of thanks be made for all men.* Now is it to be ſuppoſed that the Apoſtle would command Timothy to do, what he did not give an example of himſelf? Can it be imagined, that, when he requires of him, as the firſt thing to be done in the diſcharge of his duty, to offer up prayers for all

men; that he himſelf in the beginning of his ſeveral epiſtolary exhortations, would neglect to do the ſame, in the behalf of thoſe to whom he writes?" Page 71.

Anſ. The deſign of St. Paul in giving this exhortation to Timothy, was not to ſhew the duty of beginning every diſcourſe with prayer, but it was to inſtruct him as being a miniſter of Chriſt, that In the public aſſemblies of chriſtians, prayers and giving of thanks, ſhould be offered up for all men. It by no means follows from hence, that the ſalutations in the beginning of St. Paul's epiſtles, muſt be interpreted as prayers. He very often exhorts chriſtians to the duty of prayer; he frequently ſpeaks of his praying for them, and likewiſe for particular perſons: not that he always ſets down the very forms he made uſe of, but tells them it was his uſual cuſtom to offer up conſtant prayers, and thankſgivings. After the ſalutation, the Apoſtle generally acquaints his chriſtian converts, that he gives thanks to God for them, and that he prays for them, that he makes mention of them in his prayers, and conſequently, he cannot be ſuppoſed to have been wanting in the duty of praying for them, though the ſalutations be not prayers. Certain it is, that the ſalutation of St. John in the beginning of Revelation, is of the ſame kind with thoſe of St. Paul; and as I have proved the former not to be a prayer, ſo likewiſe it follows, that the latter are not prayers.

You proceed to ſhew, that the ſeven Spirits ſignify the Holy Ghoſt, only from Zechar. iv. 2, 6, 9. The argument you deduce from hence is to this effect: "*The ſeven lamps* in the 2d verſe are expreſsly ſaid to be *the eyes of the Lord*, and in the Revelation, *the eyes of the Lamb, which run to and fro*

fro through the whole earth. Now in the 6th verſe the Angel interpreter, in anſwer to the Prophet's enquiry, tells him what is meant by this emblematical repreſentation; *This is*, ſays he, *the word of the Lord to Zerubbabel, ſaying, not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, ſaith the Lord of Hoſts.* And therefore, the ſeveral emblematical expreſſions, both in the Prophet and the Apoſtle, do plainly denote the univerſal influences of the divine Spirit."

Anſ. The deſign of the Angel interpreter in theſe words, was not to unfold the particular meaning of the ſeven lamps, but to ſhew that Zerubbabel's ſucceſs in building the Jewiſh temple, did not depend upon worldly power, but the providence of God, expreſſed here by *his Spirit.* The preciſe meaning of the ſeven lamps is explained, ver. 10. by the eyes of the Lord, which run to and fro through the whole earth, and which probably are the ſame with the ſeven Spirits mentioned in the Revelation. Then the Prophet, upon receiving this information, proceeds to aſk the meaning of the two olive trees.

It is obſerved in the Appeal, that in all the ſubſequent adorations to God and the Lamb, there is no inſtance of any ſort of worſhip paid to the ſeven Spirits, though expreſsly ſaid to be preſent at the ſame time.

On the other hand, you alledge it as an undoubted fact, "that theſe ſeven Spirits are never once mentioned, as joining in any act of worſhip, though every creature of God through the whole univerſe, is frequently deſcribed as worſhipping God and the Lamb. And therefore, you infer from the ſuppoſition of worſhip being paid to the ſeven Spirits in the ſalutation, that this ſilence ſhould induce us

to conclude, wherever afterwards the ſame deſcription of the Deity occurs, receiving adoration and praiſe, theſe emblematical repreſentatives of the Holy Spirit, are implied as a joint object of worſhip." Pages 73, 74.

Anſ. What is advanced in the Appeal, is a plain matter of fact, which you cannot deny: on the other hand, you expreſs yourſelf very poſitively, that theſe ſeven Spirits are never once mentioned, as joining in any act of worſhip, though every other creature frequently is. Upon a review the direct contrary appears extremely probable. Let the 6th verſe of the 5th chapter, be compared with 8th, 11th, 12th, and 13th verſes of the ſame chapter: *And I beheld, and lo in the midſt of the throne, and of the four beaſts, and in the midſt of the elders, ſtood a Lamb as it had been ſlain, having ſeven horns and ſeven eyes, which are the ſeven Spirits of God, ſent forth into all the earth.* ver. 6. *The four beaſts and four and twenty elders* are repreſented as *falling down before the Lamb.* ver. 8. And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many Angels round about the throne, and the *beaſts and the elders* —— ver. 11. *ſaying, with a loud voice, worthy is the Lamb that was ſlain to receive power:* —— ver. 12. *And every creature which is in heaven and on the earth* —— is repreſented as joining in this ſolemn act, ver. 13. The ſeven Spirits are mentioned with the beaſts and the elders in the midſt of the throne. The beaſts and the elders firſt worſhip the Lamb, and then it is expreſsly ſaid, that many Angels round about the throne, and every creature in heaven and on the earth, join in this ſolemn act. Now what reaſon can be aſſigned, why the ſeven Spirits of God ſhould be excepted out of the number of worſhippers, when they were juſt before repreſented

ſented about the throne? As I have plainly proved them to be Angels, they are certainly included in the many Angels round about the throne, who worſhipped God and the Lamb. Upon the whole, as no inſtance of worſhip is paid to the ſeven Spirits, ſo it appears that they are repreſented as worſhippers of God and the Lamb. As to your ſuppoſition, that the ſeven Spirits as being the emblematical repreſentatives of the Holy Ghoſt, are implied as a joint object of every act of worſhip, recorded in the Revelation; this only proves the ſore diſtreſs you labour under to ſupport the Athanaſian cauſe, it being abſolutely incredible, that St. John ſhould intend the Holy Ghoſt as an object of worſhip, of which he has not ſaid one word; God and the Lamb, are the only perſons expreſsly mentioned, to whom religious worſhip is attributed.

You conclude this article with obſerving, in direct oppoſition to St. Peter's ſolemn determination, "that Chriſt was *not made Lord*, and maintain that he is Lord and King, in as high and abſolute a ſenſe as the Father, who freely imparted to him from all eternity his dominion. The almighty Son, received his almighty power eternally, from his almighty Father, and therefore with him is the almighty God, whoſe kingdom is from everlaſting to everlaſting." Pages 74, 75.

Anſ. Your high flown language is not warranted by Scripture, as I have demonſtratively proved: and remarkable it is, that your own language neceſſarily implies the inferiority of Chriſt to almighty God, at the very time that you labour very hard to make him ſtrictly equal: for if the Father freely imparted to the Son his dominion and power; and if the Son received his almighty power from

the Father, it neceſſarily follows that he is inferior to the Father. Common ſenſe points out an eſſential difference between the free giver and receiver; the former muſt certainly be acknowledged to be ſuperior.

With reſpect to part of your next paragraph, we are both agreed, that Chriſt will at the conſummation of all things, reſign the kingdom into the hands of his Father, from whom he received it, which again demonſtrates his inferiority to the Father: the Apoſtle ſays, that God may be all in all, that is, God will then govern without a mediator; on the other hand, you take care to conclude, according to your cuſtom, let the premiſes be what they will, that the three perſons may appear to be one God, which notion I have abundantly confuted.

The attributes of God are next to be conſidered.

You obſerve in general with regard to God's attributes, "that they cannot be aſcribed to Chriſt in any ſenſe at all, unleſs in the ſame high and abſolute ſenſe in which they are aſcribed to the Father. For all the attributes of God, are eſſentially appropriate to the divine nature, and therefore undeniably incommunicable: no leſs therefore, than God can be ſaid to enjoy them; to aſcribe them in an inferior degree to any other, is to ſuppoſe them to be, not only communicated, but to be what they are, and leſs than what they are at the ſame time: a contradiction, which cannot be got over by any man living." Page 81.

Anſ. Here you take it for granted, that Chriſt has the ſame divine nature with the Father, and conſequently, the ſame eſſential perfections, which is evidently begging the point in queſtion; and

then

then you fairly prove, that Chriſt muſt have the ſame atrributes with the Father, and in as high a ſenſe, when you have firſt ſuppoſed that they are individually the ſame, which indeed is making Chriſt the ſame perſon with the Father. Again, you are guilty of an expreſs contradiction: you ſuppoſe the attributes of God to be incommunicable, that is, not poſſible to be communicated to any other being, which doubtleſs is very true; no perſon, or being, can poſſibly be poſſeſſed of the *ſame eſſential perfections* with the one ſupreme God; and yet you expreſsly allow, that Chriſt received his knowledge from the Father; and conſequently, you make an attribute of God capable of being communicated. On the other hand, you firſt ſuppoſe me to aſſert, that Chriſt has the attributes of God, and then to maintain that he has them in an inferior ſenſe: whereas I have uniformly profeſſed, and have clearly proved, that Chriſt cannot poſſibly be thought to have the ſame eſſential perfections with the Father, becauſe our Saviour has undeniably declared, in vaſt numbers of paſſages, that he himſelf, and all his powers and attributes, were derived from the Father; and with regard to ſome particular perfections, he has abſolutely diſclaimed all pretenſions of poſſeſſing them in as high a ſenſe as the Father: and you yourſelf muſt acknowledge, that Chriſt is not ſelf-exiſtent, but is derived from the Father, which conceſſion demonſtratively overthrows the whole of what you are contending for under this head. For how can Chriſt have the ſame attributes, and the ſame perfections with the Father, if he confeſſedly wants ſelf-exiſtence, and abſolute independence, which is the grand and eſſential perfection of the one ſupreme God?

With reſpect to the attribute of knowledge, there are all the texts fairly produced in the Appeal, p. 45. 2d edit. which are uſually alledged in proof of Chriſt's omniſcience, or knowing all things, John ii. 24. John xvi. 30. Revel. ii. 23. It is there obſerved, that theſe texts could not be intended to ſet forth the knowledge of Chriſt, in as extenſive a degree as the knowledge of the Father, becauſe our Saviour himſelf has plainly told us, that he did not know the day of judgment. As to John ii. 24. it is juſtly ſaid, that St. John plainly ſpeaks of Jeſus as a man who knew all men, without taking the leaſt notice of his extraordinary perfections, and therefore he could eaſily diſcern whom he could truſt; Jeſus did not commit himſelf unto them, becauſe he knew all men; and this is no more than the Apoſtles were enabled by the Spirit of God to do, as to ſome particular perſons, upon ſeveral occaſions.

You anſwer the former part of this, by aſſerting the direct contrary without any proof. As to the latter part, you obſerve, "that the Apoſtles were enabled by the Spirit of God to know men: (of which I had taken expreſs notice) whereas Chriſt's knowledge, though he received it from the Father, is as truly, and as properly his own, as it is the Father's, and as perfect too, becauſe he received it from the Father."

Anſ. When the Apoſtles were poſſeſſed of the knowledge of men's hearts upon ſome particular occaſions, that knowledge was as much their own as any other knowledge, unleſs you will maintain this abſurdity, that no knowledge can be ſtiled our own, if we derive it from another perſon; in which caſe, the knowledge of a ſcholar cannot be called his own, becauſe he received it from a maſter. But you

you contradict yourself in the very next words, for you assert that Christ's knowledge is properly his own, though he received it from the Father, and yet you will not allow the Apostles knowledge to be their own, because they received it from the Holy Spirit. Again, you maintain that Christ's knowledge is as perfect as the Father's, for that very reason, because he received it from the Father. This depends upon the supposition, that the Father cannot communicate any knowledge to the Son, without communicating the whole he possesses himself, and will equally prove that all beings, who have received knowlegde from the Father, have it in as perfect a manner as the Father, because they received it from him. Has not God formed variety of creatures, to whom he has imparted different powers and attributes? He has given Christ more extensive knowledge, than any other being. But that Christ's perfections are inferior to the Father's, undeniably appears from hence, that he received them from the Father, and they are represented as inferior, by Christ and his Apostles. To prove your point, you quote, "John xvi. 13, 14, 15. *When the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all Truth; for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak, and he will shew you things to come, he shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you; all things that the Father hath are mine, therefore I said, that he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you.* Upon this you observe, that the Holy Spirit is to glorify the Son, because he is to receive from him the further knowledge to be imparted to his Disciples, even the certain knowledge of future events, which the Son calls his own. Now the knowledge of future events,

is

is one of the higheſt inſtances of divine omniſcience. But Chriſt declares without the leaſt exception, all things which the Father hath to be his, as truly and properly Chriſt's as the Father's; as our Saviour's words in his prayer afterwards to the Father clearly ſhew, John xvii. 10. All mine are thine, and thine are mine, and I am glorified in them, that is, the manifeſtation of this mutual property, is a clear evidence of my right and title to equal glory. The omniſcience of the Father is, therefore, Chriſt's omniſcience alſo." P. 82, 83.

Anſ. In the text you have quoted, the Holy Spirit is promiſed to the Diſciples from Chriſt, by whom they were to be inſpired with the knowledge of future events. When Chriſt ſaid, *he ſhall receive of mine*, he explains his meaning thus, *all things that the Father hath are mine:* Chriſt had a commiſſion from the Father, to ſend the Holy Spirit to enable his Apoſtles to work miracles, and foretell things to come; and therefore he might juſtly ſay, all things that the Father hath are mine, as knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands. Whatever be the true import of all things, certain it is, that Chriſt could not have the ſame right and property with the Father, who is expreſsly ſaid to have given them to him. Common ſenſe points out an eſſential difference between giving and receiving. But it ought to be obſerved (as you endeavour to eſtabliſh the contrary notion) that all things in this paſſage do not ſignify Chriſt's right to the ſame perfections with the Father, in the ſame abſolute ſenſe, but all ſuch things as are neceſſary for the accompliſhment of man's ſalvation, as appears by the following words; *Therefore I ſaid, he ſhall take of mine, and ſhall ſhew it unto you.* As for the infallible knowledge

knowledge of future events, it may be juſtly eſteemed an inſtance of divine omniſcience. But we are expreſsly aſſured by Chriſt himſelf and his Apoſtles, that the knowledge of future events was derived from his God and Father. Revel. i. 1. *The Revelation of Jeſus Chriſt, which God gave unto him to ſhew unto his ſervants, things which muſt ſhortly come to paſs, and he ſent and ſignified it by his Angel, unto his ſervant John.* When God thinks fit to reveal future events to his creatures, he employs ſome inferior agents for this important purpoſe. You argue that the omniſcience of the Father, is Chriſt's omniſcience, becauſe Chriſt received the knowledge of future events from the Father; and you may as well argue, that the omniſcience of Chriſt, is the omniſcience of the Angel, for the Angel (or Holy Spirit), received it from Chriſt; and likewiſe, that the omniſcience of the Angel, is the omniſcience of John, who received it from the Angel. The ſame argument directly proves, that the Prophets and Apoſtles were omniſcient, or knew all things, becauſe they received the knowledge of future events from God. As for that expreſſion of our Saviour, John xvii. 10. *All mine are thine, and thine are mine*, which you produce to prove Chriſt's right to equal glory with the Father; not to repeat what has been ſufficiently ſhewn above, that the whole prayer is a demonſtration of the contrary, this refers to true believers in Chriſt, and is of the ſame import with what our Lord elſewhere plainly expreſſes; Every one who receives Chriſt, receiveth him that ſent him; and every one *who is drawn by the Father*, John vi. 44. that is, who has a true notion of the Father, and is diſpoſed to do his will, *cometh unto Chriſt*. Chriſt was glorified by his Diſciples, becauſe they acknowledged

acknowledged his doctrine as the word of God, and ſo owned his divine authority.

John xvi. 30. I have explained above at large; See pages 78—80.

That *all things* in Scripture, is very often uſed in a limited ſignification, you are obliged to grant.

With reſpect to our Saviour's knowing the hearts of men, the argument ariſing from it, is fairly ſtated in the Appeal, and it is obſerved that God may be ſaid alone to know the hearts of the children of men, becauſe he knows all things in the moſt eminent manner; but notwithſtanding this, he might communicate the knowledge of the hearts of men to other beings. See Appeal, p. 46. 2d edit.

You call this "poorly begging the queſtion, which will never be granted, to wit, that God might communicate the knowledge of the hearts of men to other beings; which is juſt the ſame thing as to ſay, that God might communicate his incommunicable knowledge to other beings." Page 84.

Anſ. Surely this cannot be juſtly deemed begging the queſtion, as it is a matter of fact plainly revealed, that God has actually communicated the knowledge of the hearts of men to other beings; for the Apoſtles received this knowledge as to ſome particular perſons; and it is expreſsly declared, that Chriſt received this knowledge in a more extenſive degree, ſo as to be able to ſearch even the hearts and reins of every particular perſon; otherwiſe, he would be incapable of judging men according to their works.

You go on and maintain, that "God's knowledge is the ſame in one as in any other inſtance; but

but in every conceivable inſtance, it is not only infinite, but peculiar and eſſential to the divine nature: for the knowledge of God implies the knowledge of an infinite and all perfect being. To ſuppoſe a portion of God's knowledge communicated to any other being, is to ſuppoſe the ſame knowledge to be infinite and finite at the ſame time." Page 84.

Anſ. That almighty God cannot communicate his very individual knowledge to any other being, is true as being abſolutely impoſſible; but to affirm that God cannot communicate ſome portion of any particular kind of knowledge, and which inferior beings are capable of receiving, as for inſtance, the knowledge of the hearts of men, is a direct inſult upon common ſenſe, and the plain declarations of Scripture, as Chriſt and his Apoſtles are undeniable inſtances of this knowledge being communicated to inferior beings. Your way of arguing has a tendency to prove, that the Apoſtles, as well as Chriſt, as they have received the knowledge of God, which is peculiar to the divine nature, are poſſeſſed of infinite perfections. Theſe are your premiſes: knowing the hearts of men is one inſtance of God's infinite knowledge, and peculiar to the divine nature, and to ſuppoſe this knowledge communicated to a finite being, is to ſuppoſe a finite actually poſſeſſed of an infinite perfection. Now the Scripture expreſsly tells us, that Chriſt had this knowledge imparted to him in a very extenſive degree, and the Apoſtles had it in ſome inſtances. What follows then from your argument, but that Chriſt and the Apoſtles were poſſeſſed of infinite perfections? The fixing ſuch an abſurdity upon Scripture, ſhould naturally lead you to a more rational interpretation.

But

But one abſurdity generally produces another: in the next ſtep you venture to affirm, that "human knowledge differs, not only in degree, but totally in kind, from divine knowledge; for if it was of the ſame kind, it would be infinite and perfect, contrary to experience and fact, and a finite being would be poſſeſſed of an infinite perfection." Pages 84, 85.

Anſ. If the divine knowledge was totally different in kind from human knowledge, it would be abſolutely impoſſible for us to form the leaſt conception of it; juſt as a blind man can have no notion of colours, nor a deaf man of ſounds. If this was the caſe, where would be the propriety of the Pſalmiſt's queſtion, He that teacheth man knowledge, ſhall not he know? Which neceſſarily implies, that the knowledge of the Creator is of the ſame kind with the knowledge of the creature, though the one be infinite, and the other finite. One of the beſt ways of proving the perfections of the almighty Creator, is by arguing from the effect to the cauſe: as in created beings there are many degrees of knowledge, it hence neceſſarily follows that the perfection of knowledge muſt be in God, becauſe no being can give to another, any perfection that he does not poſſeſs himſelf. But what would become of this plain and demonſtrative argument, if the knowledge of God was of a different kind from the knowledge of men?

In the next place you argue, that "Chriſt's knowledge is the very ſame with the Father's, becauſe he received it from the Father." The abſurdity of this I have already taken notice of, which equally proves all inferior beings, who receive knowledge from God, all-knowing as well as Chriſt. Only it is proper to examine the text you quote

quote for this purpoſe, namely, John x. 15. *As the Father knoweth me, even ſo I know the Father.* You infer from hence, that "the Son's knowledge is different from all human knowledge, and yet the very ſame with the Father's, becauſe he received it from him. And therefore, Chriſt muſt be of an infinite nature, and conſequently of the ſame divine nature with the Father." Page 85.

Anſ. Let the foregoing verſe be read, and the direct contrary will plainly appear: *I am the good Shepherd, and know my Sheep, and am known of mine; even as the Father knoweth me, and I know the Father.* The latter clauſe was deſigned to illuſtrate the former, and is not an independent ſentence, as our tranſlation ſeems to make it. The ſenſe of it is evidently this: there is a like harmony between Chriſt and his true Diſciples, as there is between his Father and him; he knows them, and is known by them, even as the Father knows him, and he knows the Father. If you infer from hence, that Chriſt's knowledge is the ſame in all poſſible reſpects with the Father's; I can infer exactly the ſame thing, with reſpect to Chriſt's Diſciples, that their knowledge likewiſe is the ſame with Chriſt's, and conſequently, they muſt be ſuppoſed to have the ſame divine nature with the Father and Son. Such palpable abſurdities, which neceſſarily follow from a zeal to defend a doctrine invented by men, will, I hope, drive the learned Athanaſians into a more rational way of interpreting Scripture.

It is obſerved in the Appeal, p. 47. 2d edit. that our Saviour's extraordinary knowledge, with which he was endued after his reſurrection and aſcenſion, was given him by God, upon account of his humiliation and ſufferings, which plainly and

and undeniably appears from Revelations i. 1. and v. 9.

In anſwer to this you take notice, that my expoſition is ſtrained a little too far, and produce texts from other places to invalidate my interpretation, namely, that *Chriſt knew all things*, which I have examined above; that *He had the words of eternal life*, and ſo had the Apoſtles the words of eternal life, when they were fully inſtructed by the Holy Ghoſt; that *the Father ſhewed him all things*, all things here is not uſed in the univerſal ſenſe, but denotes ſuch things as were neceſſary for the government of the church; neither is it neceſſary to ſuppoſe, that every thing ſhould be communicated to him at once, as the contrary plainly appears from our Saviour's words. You add further, that Chriſt actually exiſted *from the beginning* with the Father, and *was in the boſom of the Father*, which is very far from implying the ſame univerſal knowledge with the Father.

You aſſert, that "the opening of the book, Revel. v. is not allotted to Chriſt as a reward, but becauſe he only was able to open it. It is not the merit of his humiliation and ſufferings, which entitles him to open the book." Page 86.

Anſ. The plain account in Revel. v. and particularly, ver. 9. is a direct anſwer to your aſſertion; *And they ſung a new ſong, ſaying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the ſeals thereof: for thou waſt ſlain, and haſt redeemed us to God by thy blood.* Here the merit of Chriſt's humiliation and ſufferings is the reaſon expreſsly aſſigned, why He above all the inhabitants of heaven and earth was worthy to open the book. When you aſſert, that Chriſt only was able to open it, you are directly anſwered by the 2d, 3d, and

and 4th verſe. The reaſon given why none was able to open the book, is becauſe no perſon was found worthy. Again, you obſerve, that " they ſing this hymn of praiſe to Chriſt, before he hath opened one ſeal, immediately upon his taking the book into his hand." *Anſ.* This obſervation is of no weight, becauſe, when the Lamb was thought worthy to take the book, the heavenly inhabitants very juſtly eſteemed this act as equivalent to the opening of it, it being a neceſſary introduction to it.

You maintain that " my making Chriſt's knowledge of all things to be but gradual, hath no foundation in Scripture with regard to his being the eternal Son of God: and that my objection drawn from his ſaying, that the Son knew not the day of judgment, hath been already obviated." Page 86.

Anſ. That the knowledge of Chriſt was gradual, is as plainly declared in Scripture, as it is poſſible for words to expreſs it, namely, *Jeſus increaſed in wiſdom*, Luke ii. 52. And by what I have juſt obſerved from Revelations, his gradual knowledge is unanſwerably eſtabliſhed; we have an account of the ſtate of the church from St. John's time to the end of the world, being communicated to Chriſt by God, which before he knew not, exactly agreeable to our Lord's declaration, whilſt he was upon earth, that he did not know the day of judgment, and that the Father only knew it. What you have alledged to confound the plain meaning of this deciſive text, has been above fully conſidered.

With reſpect to the eternity of Chriſt, you obſerve " that it is ſet forth in other texts, beſides that of his being Alpha and Omega, particularly,

John i. 1. as alſo, from the application of the Pſalmiſt's words, cii. 25, *&c.* by St. Paul, Heb. i. 10. with which Col. j. 15. rightly interpreted, is conſiſtent." Page 86.

Anſ. John i. 1. has been ſhewn not to ſignify eternity; Heb. i. 10. ſhall be examined in its proper place; and Coloſs. i. 15. appears inconſiſtent with eternity, as it has been explained above.

As to the attribute of omni-preſence, or preſence in all places, uſually aſcribed to Chriſt by Athanaſian writers, you ſeem to triumph very much, as if you had certainty overthrown what is advanced in the Appeal. The ſubſtance of what you have ſaid is this:

"The ſame arguments, which are brought in the Appeal againſt Chriſt's omni-preſence (p. 48. 2d edit.) will equally hold againſt the omni-preſence of God: for if Chriſt is ſent by, or cometh forth from the Father, the Father ſends him forth from him; and if going from the Father limits him who goes, it limits him alſo who is gone from, the words being words of place with reſpect to both; they muſt therefore be underſtood figuratively; and as they are evidently inconcluſive againſt the Father's omnipreſence, ſo are they alſo againſt the Son's: and when Chriſt ſays, Matt. xviii. 20. *Where two or three are gathered together*, &c. he doth not confine his preſence to any one aſſembly, at any one time, but extends it to all poſſible aſſemblies of the faithful at the ſame time, which is the power of God alone. But if his preſence be explained by his ſending of the Spirit of the Father, which yet the words by no means admit, then the omni-preſence of that Spirit muſt be allowed, and conſequently, the divine nature reſiding therein, which only can be actually and really

really omni-preſent, contrary to the doctrine attempted to be eſtabliſhed with regard to that Spirit. So that what is advanced to overthrow the omnipreſence of Chriſt, equally affects that of God, and yet unavoidably proves that of his Spirit; which laſt, if allowed, doth by a perverſe chain of reaſoning eſtabliſh the two former." Pages 86, 87.

Anſ. When Chriſt ſays of himſelf, that he came down from heaven, this neceſſarily ſignifies his change of place; that he was upon earth, whilſt he was ſpeaking, and that he had been in heaven: the apoſtles alſo ſaw him go into heaven, and quit the earth; and conſequently, Chriſt cannot be omni-preſent, or preſent in all places, at the ſame time. Our Saviour's expreſſions are of the ſame import, when he declares, *I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world*; Again, I leave the world, and go to the Father, John xvi. 28. But then you obſerve, that this implies a limitation of place with reſpect to the Father, and conſequently, affects the omni-preſence of God. But this conſequence I deny. God is repreſented in many paſſages of the Old and New Teſtament, as having his peculiar reſidence in heaven, though the ſame Scripture plainly and frequently ſets forth his omni-preſence, which muſt be allowed in *ſome ſenſe*: but I very much queſtion, if we take Scripture for our guide, and compare all the paſſages together relating to this point, whether the omnipreſence of God be rightly explained by the learned moderns, and particularly Dr. Clarke, who makes the Eſſence of God, equally diffuſed through every part of univerſal ſpace; whereas a virtual, and not a ſubſtantial omnipreſence, ſeems to be the plain Scripture doctrine. However this point be determined, in which I am far from being poſi-

tive, our Saviour is ſaid to come forth from the Father, as having his peculiar reſidence in heaven, or, according to the modern explication, diſplaying his glory in a more extraordinary manner in heaven, than any other part of the creation; and therefore the texts quoted in the Appeal, neceſſarily imply that Chriſt is not preſent in all places; for he is plainly repreſented as changing place from heaven to earth, and from earth to heaven: and at the ſame time the omni-preſence of God, whether interpreted as ſubſtantial, or virtual, is not affected by it.

As to Matt. xviii. 20. it is owned in the Appeal, that Chriſt is perfectly acquainted in heaven with the wants of his people upon earth. Beſides, it is there obſerved, that Chriſt's preſence with his diſciples is ſufficiently accounted for by his ſending the ſpirit of the Father to comfort them in time of need. From this you infer the omni-preſence of the Spirit, and ſo the divine nature reſiding in him, contrary to the doctrine of the Appeal. That the Holy Spirit is not preſent in all places, undeniably appears from his being ſent down from heaven, and from his changing of place, it being impoſſible that the expreſſions relating to the Holy Spirit ſhould have any other ſenſe; let John i. 32. be compared with Luke iii. 21, 22. The grand objection raiſed againſt the plain account given in Scripture of the Holy Spirit is this: If the Holy Spirit be not preſent in all places, and conſequently God, he could not aſſiſt all the faithful in the world at the ſame time.

With regard to this difficulty, let it be obſerved, that we muſt allow many things to be true, though we cannot account for the manner in which they are; we may be convinced of the reality of thouſands

ſands of things, and at the ſame time be abſolutely ignorant how they are. Even as to ourſelves, it may be demonſtrated with the cleareſt evidence, that we are beings compounded of ſoul and body; but how they are united, and how the ſoul acts upon the body, we know not. But to come nearer to the point; I will propoſe a difficulty out of Scripture exactly parallel to this, of which when you give a clear ſolution, I will diſtinctly explain to you, how the Holy Spirit, though he be not preſent in all places, can aſſiſt all the faithful at the ſame time. Our Saviour in the 4th chapter of Mark, when he explains the parable of the Sower, ſaith ver. 15. *And theſe are they by the way ſide, where the word is ſown, but when they have heard, Satan cometh immediately, and taketh away the word that was ſown in their hearts.* Now let us ſuppoſe the word ſown in ten thouſand different places at one time, which is the caſe every Lord's-day; how can Satan, whom you muſt deny to be preſent in all places, come immediately, and ſnatch away the word, out of the hearts of the greater part of the hearers? Thus Satan is ſaid to hold the impenitent, who make the greater part of mankind, in his ſnare, and take them captive at his will, yea to deceive the whole world, Revel. xii. 9. xx. 2, 3. And yet you dare not affirm, that this unclean Spirit is preſent in all places. Why therefore ſhould you conclude, that the Holy Spirit is preſent in all places, becauſe he imparts aſſiſtance to the faithful, when the Scripture hath plainly declared, that he changeth place? Beſides, we are taught by Scripture, that not only the Holy Spirit, who is the chief of the angelic Hoſt, but likewiſe the Angels are employed by God and Chriſt, in various offices for the benefit of the

faithful. As for the Holy Spirit's being able to aſſiſt ſo many perſons, we may be well aſſured, that, when the Almighty thinks fit to employ an inferior agent, for the accomplishment of any work, he will ſurely make it good, though we are abſolutely ignorant of the manner in which it is done. However, for the ſatisfaction of ſincere chriſtians, it may be juſtly obſerved, that the Holy Spirit dwelleth in all the ſaints diſperſed through the world, not in his perſon, or ſubſtance, but by his gifts, or effects, communicated to them.

Thus, I hope, I have ſufficiently cleared up the difficulties, with which you ſuppoſed me preſſed, with regard to the omnipreſence of Chriſt and the Holy Spirit. Be pleaſed to take notice, that there is a wide difference between difficulties and downright contradictions; the manner of almoſt every thing is attended with the former; but the latter, with which your ſcheme plentifully abounds, render the rational belief of it abſolutely impoſſible.

It is obſerved in the Appeal. that the true rendering of John iii. 13. ſhould be, *which was in heaven*, of which the Greek is capable, as appears by the inſtance cited, *Whereas I was blind, now I ſee* John ix 25

In order to invalidate this, you are obliged to inſert a word in the text without any neceſſity, namely, *before*, and even with this inſertion you cannot make ſenſe of it, *I being* (before) *blind, now ſee.* Let it be tried thus, whereas I am blind before, and the nonſenſe of it is evident, it being not conſiſtent with ſenſe, or grammar, that the ſame act ſhould be expreſſed by one word ſignifying the preſent time, namely, *I am*, and by another

ther the paſt, namely, *before*. * You add, with reſpect to John iii. 13. that "to give the words of our Saviour a paſt ſignification, would reduce the ſentence into a needleſs repetition of what was ſufficiently expreſſed before; for he who came from heaven, muſt be ſuppoſed to have been firſt in heaven."

Anſ. Though our Saviour muſt be ſuppoſed to have firſt been in heaven, yet it may be properly expreſſed, as it was a matter of conſiderable importance.

Revel. i. 8. Has been ſufficiently conſidered above.

With regard to the attribute of immutability, there are cited in the Appeal, Heb. i. 12.—xiii. 8. As to the firſt, there are reaſons offered to ſhew, that the 10th, 11th, and 12th verſes, are not applied to Chriſt, but to God the Father. Part of the firſt reaſon, I freely give up to your animadverſion, namely, that it was not likely that the Apoſtle ſhould apply this to Chriſt, becauſe he had declared, ver. 2. that God by his Son made the worlds, and ſo would be guilty of a needleſs repetition: I ſo far agree with you, that the repetition would be needleſs with reſpect to the Father, as well as Son: and if the appeal ſhould ever be printed again during my life, I will ſtrike it out, as indeed I would fairly and openly retract the whole piece, if you could have convinced my underſtanding; for I write for truth, and not for victory.

* The word ειμι in other inſtances expreſſes the paſt time; John xiv. 9. τοσουτον χρονον μεθ' υμων ειμι, Have I been ſo long time with you? 2 Cor. viii. 9. δι υμας επτωχευσε, πλουσιος ων, Though he was rich, yet for your ſakes he became poor. See likewiſe, Gen. xxxi. 38.

But the remaining part of the firſt reaſon I think of weight, to which you have given no anſwer; namely, It is obſervable that the creation of the heavens and the earth is never aſcribed immediately to the Son in ſuch terms, but it is conſtantly ſaid, That all things were made through him, John i. 3. 1 Cor. viii. 6. Epheſ. iii. 9. I cannot ſee that the Apoſtle's deſign was, as you repreſent it, to ſhew the foundation and grounds, upon which he declared, ver. 2. that God by his Son made the worlds, and alſo the propriety of his calling the Son, God, as well as the Father. On the other hand, I am ſtill ſatisfied that the words are applied to the Father, which fully anſwers the Apoſtle's deſign, and ſtill think my other reaſons good and ſolid; namely, Thou, Lord, is moſt naturally referred to God the Father, in order to eſtabliſh the higheſt aſſurance of the continuance of Chriſt's kingdom, as being given him by the ſupreme Lord, whoſe unchangeable nature the Pſalmiſt ſets forth. But you ſay, this ſort of aſſurance was quite unneceſſary, the power and unchangeable nature of God being already ſufficiently known, by them to whom the Apoſtle writes. Very true, it was ſo; and for that very reaſon it was an argument proper to be urged. As they were well aſſured of the unchangeable nature of God; ſo they might have the higheſt reaſon to be ſatisfied of the continuance of Chriſt's kingdom, which was given him by the immutable Lord of the whole creation.

The Apoſtle's view in this chapter, was to prove that Chriſt was a perſon ſuperior in dignity to Angels; for which purpoſe, he employs ſeveral concluſive arguments, which would appear very impertinent, if the 10th, 11th, and 12th verſes, were

were directed to Chriſt: for if Chriſt was the ſupreme Lord Jehovah, who made the heavens and the earth; if he be immutable, and his years do not fail, it is evident at firſt ſight, that this perſon is infinitely ſuperior to all angelic beings; and therefore, when the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the Son being *made* better than the Angels, as the perſon whom the Father hath *appointed* heir of all things, he makes uſe of arguments quite unneceſſary, and which indeed convey a notion of his perſon, below his real dignity; which is likewiſe the caſe of the laſt deſcription of the Son in this chapter, *Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footſtool. Sit thou*, neceſſarily ſets forth the ſupreme authority of the Father, by whom the Son was raiſed to his exalted dignity. But what is this in compariſon with the character of Lord Jehovah, who made the heavens and the earth? And conſequently, unleſs we ſuppoſe the Apoſtle to talk in an improper ſtrain, we muſt apply the 10th, 11th, and 12th verſes, to the Father.

It is allowed, that the 8th and 9th verſes are taken from the Pſalmiſt, and applied to Chriſt. But it does not follow from hence, that the 10th verſe, &c. muſt be applied to him. I agree with you, that the copulative particle *and*, is not a part of the Pſalmiſt's words, and likewiſe that it was intended by the Apoſtle, to connect what follows with the foregoing; but I differ from you in the concluſion, and think that, as this is a new citation, the Apoſtle would have ſaid, *Unto the Son he ſaith*; as ver. 8. or, *and again*, as ver. 5, 6. and chap. ii. 13. but he ſays, *and, Thou Lord:* now the God laſt mentioned, was the God of Chriſt, Who had anointed him with the oil of gladneſs above his fellows. Upon which it was very natural

tural for the author to break out into the celebration of his power, and more particularly his unchangeable duration, his view in citing the Pſalmiſt's words, being to prove Chriſt's durable kingdom mentioned before. *Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; God, thy God, hath anointed thee; and thou, Lord,* that is, Thou who haſt promiſed Chriſt an everlaſting kingdom, *art the ſame who haſt laid the fonndation of the earth, which will periſh at laſt; but thou remaineſt, and thy years ſhall not fail.*

You obſerve as to the third reaſon, urged in the Appeal (p. 50. 2d edit.) that "you cannot ſee how the Pſalmiſt's inferring from this very paſſage, the temporary duration of the children of God's ſervant's, can be applied to infer the eternal duration of Chriſt's kingdom. Becauſe God gives a finite duration to one being, can it be inferred merely from thence, that he will give an infinite duration to another? Again, you obſerve, that if this eſpecial anointing implies the eternal duration of the office, in the perſon anointed, the prophet Iſaiah then, who chap. lxi. 1. declares himſelf to be anointed by the Lord into the prophetic office, muſt be eternally in the actual poſſeſſion of that office." Pages 90, 91.

Anſ. You miſtake the force of the argument: it does not indeed follow, becauſe God gives a finite duration to one being, that he will give an eternal duration to another; neither does it follow, becauſe the prophet Iſaiah was anointed to the prophetic office, that he muſt be eternally in the poſſeſſion of it. But if God hath promiſed an eternal kingdom to Chriſt, which is the truth of the caſe, the argument is ſolid and concluſive: the immutable nature of God is very pertinently alledged,

in order to eſtabliſh the higheſt aſſurance of the continuance of this kingdom, as being given him by the unchangeable God, who is able to make good what he had promiſed. As therefore, the Pſalmiſt had before applied this paſſage to infer this concluſion, *the children of thy ſervants ſhall continue, and their ſeed ſhall be eſtabliſhed before thee*; ſo it was very properly urged by the Apoſtle to prove, that the Son's throne ſhould be eſtabliſhed for ever and ever, as being granted to him by the unchangeable God, whoſe years ſhall not fail.

Upon the whole, I have not miſrepreſented the Apoſtle's true ſcope and deſign, but think I have given the genuine interpretation of it, which muſt be left to the deciſion of our readers.

Heb. xiii 8. You animadvert ſeverely upon my interpretation of this text, though you allow it right; and obſerve "that the unchangeableneſs of the doctrine, is inferred from the unchangeableneſs of Chriſt: ſo that this deſcription is literally and directly true of Chriſt, whilſt it is only figuratively true of the doctrine." Pages 91, 92.

Anſ. The unchangeableneſs of Chriſt's doctrine, does not infer the abſolute immutability of his nature, in the ſame ſenſe with the ſupreme Father. God hath appointed Chriſt to be the teacher of a doctrine never to be altered. How does his immutable nature follow from hence? God might, if he had thought fit, have employed a common Angel, or Prophet, to have ſet forth the terms of the Chriſtian Covenant; in which caſe, the ſame thing that the Apoſtle here ſays of Chriſt, might with equal propriety, have been ſaid of any other perſon commiſſioned by God. With reſpect to your next obſervation, that this deſcription is an alluſion to the words of the 12th ver. of chap. i. of this

this Epiſtle, cited by the Apoſtle from the cii Pſalm already examined, you have not produced the leaſt proof of any ſuch alluſion, and may be as eaſily denied, as affirmed, there being nothing in the form of the expreſſion, or in the context, that points out any ſuch thing.

Heb. iii. 3, 4, 5, 6. I have added the 5th and 6th verſes, in order to clear up the Apoſtle's meaning. Your argument drawn from 3d and 4th verſes, ſtands thus: "Chriſt is directly ſaid to be the builder of Moſes, or the Jewiſh church; and immediately afterwards; he that built all things, is expreſsly declared to be God. But if Chriſt be not God, it is not true that he built Moſes, or the Jewiſh church, becauſe God who built all, built that alſo: but it is true that Chriſt built Moſes, or the Jewiſh church, becauſe the Apoſtle declares it. Chriſt therefore muſt be God, who building all things, built Moſes, or the Jewiſh church alſo." Page 92.

Anſ. This I grant you, appears plauſible at firſt view, but upon examination, the argument is found fallacious, by adding the following verſes. That Chriſt is not ſtiled God in this particular paſſage, is evident from hence, that Moſes is deſcribed as faithful in all his houſe, namely, God's, and Chriſt as a Son over his houſe, namely, God's, (not his own, according to our tranſlation). But if God, ſignifies Chriſt, it ſpoils the elegance of the Apoſtle's compariſon; for then, there is no perſon mentioned, to whom Chriſt can be ſaid to be faithful. The plain deſign of the Apoſtle was to ſhew, that Chriſt was ſuperior to Moſes, which he proves by this argument: Moſes acted in the capacity of a ſervant to God, but Chriſt in that of a Son; both were found faithful, but to whom? Surely

Surely to God, though Chriſt was in the more honourable relation. Let it be obſerved that Chriſt, ver. 2. is expreſsly ſaid to be faithful to him that appointed him, namely, God. Beſides, if God ſignifies Chriſt, the Apoſtle would certainly have ſtopt here; for nothing farther was neceſſary to ſhew, that Chriſt was ſuperior to Moſes, when he had declared that Chriſt was God, the creator of all things: but the Apoſtle immediately adds, that Chriſt was faithful as a Son, and not as a ſervant, which muſt be thought very impertinent, after having ſtiled him God. If we conſider the beginning and concluſion of the whole argument, it will evidently appear, that the ſtreſs of it depends, upon Chriſt's being faithful to God as a Son, and not upon his being ſtiled God.

John i. 1. has been conſidered above, and it has been demonſtratively ſhewn, that Chriſt is not ſtiled God in as high a ſenſe as the Father.

Creation and preſervation aſcribed to Chriſt, have been likewiſe conſidered above. What you have farther added to confirm your interpretation, ſhall be anſwered here.

It is obſerved in the Appeal that the firſt chapter of the Coloſſians contains as high characters of Chriſt, as are to be found in any one chapter of the New Teſtament. You have not denied the truth of this obſervation; and yet from this very chapter it may be proved with demonſtrative evidence, that Chriſt is a perſon inferior to his God and Father by ſuch expreſſions, as are incapable of any other interpretation, without offering violence to the plaineſt declarations. Whence it may be juſtly inferred, that the higheſt characters of Chriſt, namely, Creation and Preſervation, muſt be

be interpreted conſiſtently with the acknowledgment of one ſupreme God and Father of all.

1. God is diſtinguiſhed in this chapter five times from Chriſt: *Paul an apoſtle of Jeſus Chriſt by the will of God*——*Peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt*———*We give thanks to the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*——*who* (namely Chriſt) *is the image of the inviſible God*———*To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this myſtery among the Gentiles; which is Chriſt in you, the hope of glory.*

2. Let the characters applied to Chriſt in this chapter be reviewed. 1. He is ſtiled *the Image of the inviſible God.* It is obſerved in the Appeal (p. 53. 2d edit.) that man is expreſsly ſaid to have been made in the image of God. Doubtleſs Chriſt is the image of God in a far higher ſenſe than man; but ſtill impoſſible it is that he ſhould be that very God, of whom he is ſaid to be the image.

You anſwer thus: "If by an higher ſenſe you mean only in the ſame manner, tho' in an higher degree, the Scripture affords not the leaſt foundation for this; but if you thereby mean a different ſenſe in every reſpect, your illuſtration is nothing to the purpoſe." p. 97.

Anſ. Man is ſtiled the image of God, as he is an intelligent being capable of immortality; Chriſt has the ſame character in an higher ſenſe, as the perfections of God ſhine forth in him with greater luſtre than any other being. When you add, that the apoſtle intends by the inviſible God the perſon of the Father, it is very true, it can poſſibly have no other ſignification; and the plain argument made uſe of to ſhew, that Chriſt cannot be that very God, of whom he is ſaid to be the image,

you

you endeavour to evade by ſubſtituting the inviſible Father inſtead of God. You are obliged to aſſert, that "Chriſt is the image of his inviſible Father, and not that very Father, becauſe he is his Son;" to which you add, "but upon that very account, partaking of his divine nature, he is one God with the Father. Becauſe Chriſt is called the expreſs image of his Father, it by no means follows, that he is therefore of a different nature."

Anſ. As to metaphyſical nature or eſſence, the ſcripture never meddles with it, as I have before obſerved: I have likewiſe explained the different ſenſes, in which Chriſt is called the Son of God, not one of which anſwers your purpoſe of proving Chriſt's nature to be the ſame with the Father's. *

2. Another character applied to Chriſt in this chapter is, the *firſt-born of every creature, the firſt-born from the dead.* The firſt expreſſion, as I have already proved by producing all the parallel expreſſions, naturally ſignifies the firſt Being whom God produced or created; and all agree that the latter ſignifies the firſt who roſe from the dead. Now it is very abſurd to apply either of theſe characters to the ſupreme God.

3. To determine the point beyond all poſſible doubt, I obſerved that it is declared; *it pleaſed the Father that in him* (namely, Chriſt) *all fulneſs ſhould dwell:* ſo that it is owing to the good plea-

* With reſpect to your argument, that the *knowledge of God*, ver. 10. refers to Chriſt, becauſe the knowledge of *his will*, ver. 9. means the knowledge of Chriſt, it has no weight, becauſe the knowledge of Chriſt's will is the ſame with the knowledge of God, Chriſt being ſent into the world to enlighten the minds of men with right notions of God; and therefore, if chriſtians were filled with the knowledge of Chriſt's will, they muſt of courſe increaſe in the knowledge of God. Neither does the apoſtle go on to ſpeak, in the next verſe, with immediate reference to Chriſt, as you imagine, the words of the 11th verſe being more applicable to God, than to Chriſt.

ſure

ſure of the Father, that the high characters ſet forth in this chapter are juſtly aſcribed to Chriſt.

To which you anſwer, "is it not as evident from hence, that all fulneſs actually dwelleth in Chriſt, as that it is derived to him from the Father? and is it not equally evident from the ſame words, that he, as the Son, is as fully perfect as the Father? what then doth your inference mean, but that Chriſt owing all to the Father's good pleaſure, is not of the ſame duration with the Father? as if it was thereby plainly intimated, that he began not to exiſt till it pleaſed the Father; and conſequently, there was a time when he did not exiſt, and therefore but a mere creature." p. 99.

Anſ. By all fulneſs is here evidently meant what the apoſtle had ſet forth in this chapter concerning Chriſt: when you argue from hence, that all fulneſs dwelling in Chriſt, makes the Son equally perfect with the Father, you might as well argue the ſame thing with reſpect to all true chriſtians, Epheſ. iii. 18, 19. St. Paul prays, that the Epheſians might be filled with all the fulneſs of God, that is, that they might be ſufficiently acquainted with the extraordinary love of God in ſending Chriſt into the world, and that they might abound in all other ſpiritual graces, that being the ſenſe determined by the context. In like manner, all fulneſs in this paſſage naturally refers to the high characters aſcribed to Chriſt in this chapter: and nothing can be more evident than that all Chriſt's perfections were owing to the Father's good pleaſure, and conſequently, that he is a perſon dependent upon the Father, whether eternal or not. As for your inference from my ſcripture premiſes, that there was a time when Chriſt did not exiſt, and therefore but a mere creature; I will not be ac-

accountable for ſuch expreſſions, becauſe they are not found in Scripture, and could heartily wiſh that unſcriptural forms of expreſſions had been ſpared on all ſides in this famous controverſy. If the firſt-born of every creature neceſſarily implies that Chriſt was not eternal, as indeed it ſeems to my underſtanding, then the charge of denying the ſame duration to the Son with the Father, falls upon the apoſtle.

Here you think fit to put two queſtions, "Doth not all fulneſs dwell alſo in the Father? and doth this fulneſs dwell in the Father according to his good pleaſure, or doth it not?" p. 99.

Anſ. To the firſt queſtion the anſwer is very plain: all fulneſs in the moſt perfect ſenſe doth certainly dwell in the ſupreme God and Father of all, from whom all other perſons and beings derive their powers and perfections. To the ſecond I anſwer thus: That the exiſtence of God a ſelf-exiſting being, and thoſe perfections, namely, eternity, unity, &c. which neceſſarily flow from his ſelf-exiſtent nature, ſhould depend upon his good pleaſure, meaning thereby his will, is manifeſtly impoſſible: but if by good pleaſure you mean with approbation, in this ſenſe it may be admitted. The exiſtence of God, and the natural perfections neceſſarily ariſing from his ſelf-exiſtent nature, are certainly with his approbation; but they do not depend upon his will in the ſame ſenſe that beings do, whom he hath produced. If by fulneſs you mean the exerciſe of God's moral attributes, namely, Truth, Juſtice, Mercy, and Goodneſs, fulneſs in this ſenſe dwelleth in him according to his good pleaſure in the ſenſe of will, becauſe the exerciſe of theſe depends upon his will, in which the liberty of God conſiſts.

As for ſubtle metaphyſical enquiries, whether God eternally willed that all fulneſs ſhould dwell in Chriſt, or not, I meddle not with them: it is ſufficient for my underſtanding, that the Scripture hath expreſsly determined, that Chriſt was the firſt being whom God produced.

Having thus determined that Chriſt is a perſon inferior to the one ſupreme God and Father of all from this very chapter, I have the higheſt reaſon to conclude, that what is ſaid of Chriſt with reſpect to creation and preſervation, muſt be interpreted conſiſtently with this inferiority. Coloſ. i. 16. All things were created by (or through) him. Ver. 17. He is before all things, and by (or through) him all things conſiſt; to which Heb. i. 3. is parallel, upholding all things by the word of his power, that is, the power of God the Father. The form of the expreſſion neceſſarily ſignifies, that Chriſt is an inferior inſtrument whom God employs. It has been already ſhewn, that IN HIM is of the ſame import with *through him.*

From this deſcription you infer "that the concurrence of Chriſt in this great work was ſo abſolutely neceſſary, that things could neither have been created or preſerved without him; and conſequently Chriſt is not an inferior inſtrument, but one God with the Father."

Anſ. As we are expreſsly aſſured, that Chriſt was a perſon produced by God, that he himſelf and all his powers were derived from the Father; it neceſſarily follows from hence, that if Chriſt was the perſon, through whom the heavens and the earth were created by God, this could not be owing to a nature equally divine with the Father, or to a power independent of God, but entirely to the will of the one ſupreme God, who thought fit

fit to employ an inferior agent in the work of creation. Neither is it juſtly inferred that the concurrence of Chriſt was abſolutely neceſſary. It is agreeable to the uſual methods of God's governing the world to act by ſubordinate agents. You may as well argue, that theſe ſubordinate agents are ſo neceſſary, that God could not carry on his ſcheme of government without them. God in the general courſe of his providence employs the rich to ſupport the poor; would you infer from hence, that God cannot ſupport the poor, without the aſſiſtance of the rich?

But ſtill you inſiſt, that St. John's expreſſion, *without him was not any thing made that was made*, and St. Paul's, *in him all things conſiſt*, is abſolutely inconſiſtent with what God ſays, Iſaiah xliv. 24. as cited in the Appeal, where he reſerves to himſelf, not only the works of creation, but preſervation alſo: but to preſerve the ſupreme power of God from abſurdly ſtanding in need of any inferior aſſiſtance, it is equally unavoidable to ſuppoſe Chriſt to be no leſs than God, and conſequently one God with the Father. The inſtance therefore produced in the Appeal (p. 52. 2d edit.) to prove the conſiſtency of God's declaration in Iſaiah with the ſuppoſition of an inferior, neceſſary agent, is by no means to the purpoſe, unleſs it had been likewiſe ſhewn, that God could not bring about his intended providences by the intervention of other means, or another inſtrument, but that by which he effected theſe; for though it is properly ſaid, that God alone did lead him, Iſrael, &c. when it is ſaid, he did it by his angel, or Moſes; yet, if it is not ſaid alſo, that nothing that was done, was done without his angel or Moſes, this latter caſe muſt be totally different

from the former: for as the Son is evidently from the neceſſity of his co-operation a partaker of the divine nature, and conſequently God; ſo when it is ſaid that God doth any thing by his Son, the perſon of the Father can be then only meant, and the act underſtood to be the joint act of Father and Son. But in the latter caſe, it being the ſole power of God, by which the act is performed, either mediately by his angel, or ſervant, or immediately by himſelf, the act is truly and properly ſaid to be the act of God alone: but then the term *God* is equally applicable to all, or any of the three perſons in the Godhead." p. 95, 96.

Anſ. You take it for granted, that the apoſtles expreſſions cited by you, imply the neceſſary concurrence of Chriſt in the works of creation and preſervation, and that this neceſſary cooperation of the Son with the Father, undeniably proves his being partaker of the divine nature, and conſequently God: whereas the apoſtles expreſſions ſet forth no ſuch notion. As God thought fit to employ Chriſt in the work of creation, it might be properly ſaid, that this work was not performed without the inferior agency of Chriſt: but that his concurrence was in ſuch a ſenſe neceſſary, as if the Almighty Governor of the world could not have created without his aſſiſtance, by no means follows from this declaration, as the apoſtles have unanimouſly declared, that Chriſt is an inferior being produced by God, and that all his powers and attributes were derived from the Father: and remarkable it is that Chriſt is conſtantly repreſented as an inferior miniſter in the work of creation. *All things were made through him.* Neither is the ſtrong expreſſion of the prophet inconſiſtent with the inferior agency of Chriſt. What you obſerve

of

of other inferior agents, that as the act is performed by the ſole power of God, it may be properly ſaid to be the act of God alone, may with equal propriety be applied to Chriſt, as he himſelf hath ſolemnly declared, that *he can do nothing of himſelf*, and that all power *was given him by the Father:* and therefore the inſtance I produced of its being ſaid, that God alone did bring the children of Iſrael out of Egypt, and yet it is declared that an angel and Moſes were employed by God in this tranſaction, was very pertinent to ſhew that God Almighty might conſiſtently be ſaid to be the *alone Maker of heaven and earth*, though it is revealed in the New Teſtament, that *God created all things by Jeſus Chriſt*. And though it is not ſaid, that not any thing was done, that was done, without Moſes, yet it might have been properly ſaid of him, as he was the perſon employed from firſt to laſt, not only in delivering meſſages to the children of Iſrael, and actually conducting them, but likewiſe as he was the immediate miniſter in the operation of the miracles themſelves. The ſtrong expreſſion of the prophet, whereby God alone is declared to create, may be illuſtrated by other inſtances. I hope it will be allowed, that raiſing the dead to life is as peculiar to God as the work of creation, and accordingly God Almighty appropriates it to himſelf in a very peculiar manner. Deut. xxxii. 39. *I even I am he, and there is no God with me: I kill, and I make alive.* 2 Cor. i. 9. Now certain it is, that in the New Teſtament the apoſtles are ſaid to have raiſed the dead, becauſe God employed them as inferior miniſters in this miraculous work. As the work of raiſing the dead may be juſtly aſcribed to God alone, tho' the apoſtles were immediately concern-

ed as inferior agents; ſo likewiſe God may be properly ſtiled the alone Creator of heaven and earth, though Chriſt was employed as an inferior inſtrument. The power, by which Chriſt, Moſes and the Apoſtles acted, was the ſole power of God; and therefore, what they did, may be properly ſaid to be the acts of God alone, as you have rightly expreſſed it of agents deemed inferior. And as you muſt neceſſarily think it unreaſonable to ſuppoſe that God could not deliver the children of Iſrael without the inferior agency of Moſes; ſo it is equally unreaſonable to imagine that God could not create without the concurrence of Chriſt: and conſequently, the argument you alledge to prove Chriſt's being partaker of the divine nature from the neceſſity of his co-operation, falls to the ground. And as to the term *God* ſignifying three perſons, when an act is ſaid to be done by God alone, you muſt be frequently reminded, that you cannot produce one paſſage in the word of God, where this term neceſſarily conveys the notion of three perſons.

With reſpect to the expreſſion, *by him all things conſiſt*, this, as obſerved in the Appeal, is of the ſame import with, *God's creating all things by* (or through *Chriſt*, to which, Heb. i. 3. *upholding all things by the word of his power*, is parallel. I obſerved that *his* power means the power of God the Father; and it certainly does ſo, according to the ſtrict propriety of the Greek, and for the very ſame reaſon that *his glory* and *his perſon* plainly ſignify the glory and perſon of God the Father. The ſenſe given in the Appeal of theſe expreſſions, namely, *by him all things conſiſt, and upholding all things by the word of his power*, ſeems to be rational, that God employs Chriſt as an inferior inſtrument

ment in the government of the world. But you take occaſion to obſerve from this expreſſion in St. Paul's epiſtle to the Hebrews, chap. i. ver. 3. that "if Chriſt be the brightneſs of the Father's glory, and the expreſs image of his perſon, he muſt be actually poſſeſſed of every eſſential quality, or attribute, that diſtinguiſhes the Father, except that one, whereby he is the Father; and therefore he is no inferior inſtrument in the government of the world." p. 96, 97.

Anſ. That the apoſtle could not poſſibly intend to repreſent Chriſt as equal to the Father in all eſſential perfections, undeniably appears from his doctrine in other plain and repeated declarations, and particularly, from this very chapter. The apoſtle's expreſſions were doubtleſs intended to ſhew that Chriſt bears a nearer reſemblance to God, than any other being revealed in Scripture: that God's perfections ſhine forth in Chriſt in a more illuſtrious manner than any other being. *Who being the brightneſs of his glory*; the word rendered brightneſs, ſignifies a ſplendid ray coming forth from a luminous body. But it would be very ſtrange to infer from hence, that Chriſt who is repreſented as a ray, muſt be equally glorious with God, the whole luminous ſubſtance, from whom he proceeds. *Expreſs image of his perſon*; the word rendered perſon, ſignifies in the Greek, Eſſence with its properties, really ſubſiſting; and Chriſt is properly the image, or juſt repreſentation of the properties of God. But an image, or repreſentation of another, muſt neceſſarily be different from him it repreſents. The Scripture makes Chriſt the image of God; but it was the invention of men in the corrupting and corrupted ages of the church to repreſent Chriſt as the image of

God's ſubſtance or eſſence, and yet at the ſame time to be the ſame ſubſtance, of which he was the image. Chriſt's being ſtiled the expreſs image of God, chiefly refers to thoſe amicable perfections of goodneſs, kindneſs and mercy, wherein Chriſt reſembled God. But when you infer from this deſcription, that Chriſt muſt poſſeſs every quality and attribute that the Father has, in as high a ſenſe as the Father; you expreſsly contradict the whole tenor of Scripture, and our Saviour's own ſolemn determination; who has aſcribed every natural and moral perfection to the Father in a more eminent ſenſe, than to himſelf, or any other being.

You ſay that "God's power is part of his glory; the Son therefore is actually poſſeſſed of the ſelf-ſame power with the Father; ſince otherwiſe he could not be in this reſpect the expreſs image or his Father." p. 97.

Anſ. That the Son ſhould have the ſelf-ſame power with the Father, is abſolutely impoſſible, becauſe this is making the Son the ſame perſon with the Father. Surely the Son might be juſtly repreſented as the expreſs image of his Father, with reſpect to power, as God has communicated ſo much power to him, as is neceſſary for the government of men and angels, and which is exerciſed to promote the ultimate glory of his God and Father, from whom he received it.

I took notice in the Appeal of many judicious chriſtians, who interpret the expreſſions in this chapter, and ſome few other paſſages in Scripture, of a moral creation of the world, or the introduction of a new ſtate of things by Jeſus Chriſt. Appeal, p. 51. 2d edit.

You

You impute this to a "diffidence in the ſtrength of my cauſe; and take care to let your readers know, that theſe judicious chriſtians were the followers of one Socinus, who taught Chriſt to be no more than a meer man, never before exiſting till he was born of the Virgin Mary." p. 100.

Anſ. I did not mention this through any diffidence in my cauſe, but from an impartial regard to truth, as really thinking that thoſe whom you ſtile Socinians, but ſhould be called Unitarian chriſtians, have ſaid more rational things for this interpretation, than perſons in your way of thinking can well imagine, who have learned to entertain a contemptible opinion of a ſet of men, whom I will venture to call brave and honeſt chriſtians, (though I allow them to have been miſtaken in ſome particulars), whoſe characters and example deſerve to be recommended to the imitation of the chriſtian world. I will juſt refer to ſome texts of the New Teſtament, that ſeem to make a moral creation not improbable. Epheſ. iii. 9.—ii. 10, 15.—Galat. vi. 15.—2 Cor. v. 17.—Coloſſ. iii. 10. James i. 18. Mark xvi. 15. In theſe texts the work of redemption is ſet forth under the name of creation.

Having thus examined what you have offered to invalidate the evidence produced from the New Teſtament, in relation to the perſon and dignity of the Son of God; I proceed to conſider your objections to my account of Chriſt's incarnation.

It is obſerved in the Appeal (p. 56. 2d edit.) that the incarnation of Chriſt, as ſet forth in Scripture, is plain and clear; namely, that the ſame divine perſon who exiſted in heaven before he was born of the Virgin Mary, aſſumed a body like ours, and conſequently became a real man, although

though his ſpiritual part was vaſtly more glorious than our ſouls. On the other ſide, the notion of Chriſt's incarnation which you contend for, is all darkneſs and confuſion; namely, that the ſame individual perſon conſiſts of two diſtinct natures, that he is perfect God and perfect man, of a reaſonable ſoul and human fleſh ſubſiſting; who, although he be perfect God and perfect man, is not two, but one Chriſt. Let the preciſe ideas of perfect God and perfect man be aſcertained: perfect God neceſſarily ſignifies a being of all poſſible perfection, ſelf-exiſtence, independence, omnipotence, eternity, juſtice, mercy and goodneſs; and perfect man ſignifies a being conſiſting of a ſpiritual part, and a body. That two ſuch beings ſhould make one perſon, which is the expreſs ſentiment of the Athanaſian creed, ſeems at firſt view an abſolute contradiction, and contrary to common ſenſe: one would be tempted to wiſh for the honour of Scripture, that ſuch a groſs abſurdity had no foundation there. Bleſſed be the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; it makes no part of the revelation derived from him, but is the meer invention of the learned, to palliate ſelf-evident contradictions, it being on all ſides agreed, that the one ſupreme God is abſolutely incapable of a ſtate of ſufferings.

I obſerve of your anſwer to my Scripture account of Chriſt's incarnation, that you do not pretend to aſſert, that the Athanaſian account is found expreſsly in Scripture: the force of what you ſay, entirely depends upon conſequences drawn from premiſes aſſumed to be true without ſufficient proof. Thus you take it for granted, that Chriſt has a divine nature, namely, the ſame nature with the Father, which doubtleſs is incapable of enduring

ing any ſort of ſufferings; and then you infer that, when Chriſt is ſaid to grow in wiſdom, to be ſorrowful even unto death, and to die, this could have no relation to his divine nature; and therefore, you ſuppoſe an human ſoul as part of Chriſt's compoſition, in order to render him capable of being, and ſuffering, what is plainly and expreſsly ſaid of him in Scripture. In other terms, unleſs you ſuppoſe an human ſoul, the cauſe you labour to ſupport, is gone for ever. As therefore, in the courſe of this debate, I have proved, that Chriſt is a perſon inferior to the one ſupreme God and Father of all; and that the texts uſually alledged to prove him of the ſame nature with the Father, prove no ſuch thing, the conſequence you draw from this ſuppoſed principle neceſſarily fails: and ſo this article might be diſmiſſed without making any farther reply. But notwithſtanding this, I am determined to examine every material article you have advanced, in order to give all poſſible ſatisfaction upon this important point.

With reſpect to the expreſſion, *The word was made fleſh*, you contend that "fleſh is ſometimes uſed in Scripture, to expreſs the whole man compoſed of ſoul and body." Page 100.

Anſ. Be it ſo; and what you would infer muſt be this, that the word was added to a ſoul and body: but in this caſe our Saviour could not be ſaid to be a man, but joined to a man. Let *the word was made fleſh*, be interpreted according to Scripture, and it will convey this ſenſe; the ſame perſon, who exiſted before in heaven, by aſſuming a body like ours, became a real man, though his ſpiritual part, namely, *the word*, was vaſtly more glorious than our ſouls, it being not neceſſary that the

the ſpiritual part of all men ſhould be exactly equal.

As to the Scripture expreſſion, *God ſent forth his ſon made of a woman*, you obſerve that "this cannot be ſtrictly true, the Son of God, according to your own conceſſion, ſubſiſting perfectly as ſuch before he was ſo born. The expreſſion therefore, muſt mean that part of him only which he received from his mother: now every man born of a woman, conſiſts of ſoul and body; and therefore, our Saviour muſt conſiſt of ſoul and body, by virtue of being born of a woman." Pages 100, 101.

Anſ. It is remarkable that Chriſt is called, the Son of God, in a very emphatical manner, upon the account of his being born of the virgin Mary; neither is he expreſly called Son of God, with regard to his pre-exiſtent ſtate, as I have obſerved above. True, every man born of a woman, conſiſts of ſoul and body; and did not our Saviour too conſiſt of a ſpiritual part, and a body by virtue of his mother? and therefore the caſe is exactly parallel, *the word* anſwering to the ſoul, which muſt appear ſtrictly ſo, if the ſoul, as it is generally believed, be immediately infuſed by God himſelf; in which caſe the body only is derived from the mother.

I with good reaſon, laid a ſtreſs upon Heb. x. 5. *A body haſt thou prepared for me*, as being ſpoke by the Meſſiah, when he profeſſed his readineſs to come into the world, in obedience to the will of God; and indeed it expreſſes with the greateſt accuracy, the notion plainly ſet forth in the Appeal, namely, that Chriſt aſſumed an human body, and ſo became a real man. That body in this paſſage ſhould ſignify ſoul and body, as you wiſh it to do, is deſtroying the uſe of language.

That

That Chriſt was not capable of human ſufferings before he came into the world, is very true; but you can never prove that the ſame perſon, when cloathed with an human body, was not liable to, and capable of, human ſufferings; the Scripture has plainly determined the direct contrary, which always ſpeaks of our Saviour as one ſingle perſon, the ſame perſon who came down from heaven, ſuffered on earth, and aſcended again into heaven.

You obſerve that Chriſt's ſpiritual part, is ſometimes expreſſed by the ſame word, whereby our ſouls are denoted; from whence you infer that our Saviour conſiſts of a divine nature, ſoul, and body. But this conſequence may be juſtly denied: as the ſpiritual part of Chriſt was united to a body, and anſwered the purpoſe of the ſoul of man, it might be expreſſed by the ſame term with the greateſt propriety.

As to Heb. ii. 14. which is cited in the Appeal, as inconſiſtent with the Athanaſian incarnation, you endeavour to prove, that *fleſh and blood*, preciſely mean the human ſoul as well as body united together: your proof is taken from ver. 17, 18. of the ſame chapter, wherein our Saviour is repreſented as a *merciful High-Prieſt*, and that *becauſe he himſelf hath ſuffered, he is able to ſuccour them that are tempted.* From whence you infer, "that this could not be, if he had not an human ſoul, as well as human body; nor could he experimentally judge of the temptations which men are liable to, if he did not experimentally try their force, by being tempted in their very nature." Pages 102, 103.

Anſ. Here you aſſume for truth, that Chriſt was incapable of being tempted, if his ſpiritual part was more excellent than the ſoul of man; a principle

principle impoſſible to be proved, and which indeed appears abſurd at firſt view, it being far from certain, that the ſouls of men are all exactly equal. It remains therefore that we interpret, Heb. ii. 14. *Foraſmuch then, as the children are partakers of fleſh and blood, he alſo himſelf* (namely, Chriſt) *took part of the ſame*, in the plain and literal ſenſe; that Chriſt took a body, that he might be capable of ſuffering and dying for the ſins of men.

You pronounce "it very abſurd to ſuppoſe, that a divine perſon, by aſſuming a body like ours, ſhould become a real man."

Anſ. If by divine perſon you mean the one ſupreme God, the ſuppoſition is abſolutely impoſſible: but if by divine perſon, you mean one of the moſt exalted rank, (though next in dignity to God) there is nothing unreaſonable in believing him capable of ſuch a ſtate, as our Saviour is repreſented to have paſſed through; there is nothing abſurd in the ſuppoſition that ſuch a ſpiritual being, by aſſuming a body, ſhould become a real man. The Scripture itſelf has determined the point, by giving the name of Men to Angels, when they were cloathed with human bodies. Neither does this (as you aſſert), make the eſſence of a man to conſiſt in the form, or ſubſtance, of his body, ſoul, or ſpirit, being an eſſential part of his compoſition: but it is not neceſſary, that all ſouls, or ſpirits, ſhould have the ſame preciſe excellence. As the true notion of a man is an intelligent being, or perſon compounded of a ſpiritual part and a body; I ſee nothing abſurd in admitting the conſequence ariſing from it, namely, that a ſoul, or ſpirit, of an higher, or lower excellence, of good or evil diſpoſitions, when animating an human body, is a real and proper man.

You

You endeavour to evade the Scripture notion of man, by inſinuating, "that Angels in the Old Teſtament only appeared like men, and were taken for ſuch by the bodily ſenſes of the ſpectators: but notwithſtanding, we are given to underſtand, that they were really Angels under an human ſemblance for that time, and by no means, and in no ſenſe, entirely repreſented as meer men; they as eaſily diveſting themſelves of that human ſemblance, as men put off their outward cloathing." Pages 103, 104.

Anſ. The Scripture account is plain and clear, that the three Angels, who appeared to Abraham, are expreſsly called men. The reaſon of which is evident from the hiſtory, becauſe they not only appeared in an human ſemblance, but likewiſe eat, drank, and performed the common offices of life. The ſame perſons are ſometimes ſtiled Angels, and ſo they were, though at the ſame time they might be juſtly called men, as being angels cloathed with human bodies. So likewiſe, in Dan. ix. 21. the angel Gabriel is ſtiled *the man Gabriel*, becauſe he was at that time cloathed with an human body. This is ſufficient to determine, that a ſuperior being, when he aſſumes an human body, is a real man. St. Paul calls our Saviour, *the man Chriſt Jeſus*, 1 Tim. ii. 3. which is exactly parallel to *the man Gabriel*. The inſertion of the word, man, implies, that he had been a ſuperior perſon. The Scripture never ſays, the man Peter, or the man Paul; but it is very proper when ſpoken of Chriſt, or an Angel, to intimate their exiſtence in a prior ſtate. And though it be admitted, that Angels could diveſt themſelves of their bodies, and the aſſumption of them was only occaſional; yet this does not invalidate the propriety of their being called

called real men, when they were actually poſſeſſed of bodies.

You now endeavour to remove the abſurdity, neceſſarily ariſing from your account of Chriſt's incarnation; namely, that it ſuppoſes Chriſt to be a being compounded of two natures, the divine and human; which ſeems to convey the notion of two intelligent perſons in the ſame being, according to the natural ſignification of the words. For this purpoſe, you conſider God under the notion of an abſtract eſſence, and likewiſe man in the ſame light: or to expreſs it more plainly, "you conſider the nature of the divine being in general, and the nature of man in general, without any regard to perſonality; and then you aſſume, that the ſoul and body, of which Chriſt's human nature is compoſed, acquired no perſonality, or did not become a real perſon, till it was applied to the individual perſon of the Son of God, whoſe nature it then became; the perſonality therefore of the divine nature, and the perſonality of the human in Chriſt, are one and the ſame individual perſonality of the Son of God. And therefore Chriſt, compoſed of theſe two natures, which yet have but one and the ſame perſonality, is ſtill but one and the ſame perſon." Pages 104, 105.

Anſ. This is a ſpecimen of thoſe nice and ſubtle diſtinctions, taken notice of in the Appeal, as beyond the reach of the unlearned, for whom the Goſpel was deſigned, as well as ſcholars. Not to animadvert upon the abſurdity that *God taken abſolutely, cannot be underſtood as a perſonal character*, which I have confuted above; I obſerve that you cannot, with all your art, get rid of the apparent contradiction charged upon your ſcheme. Let it be admitted, that the ſoul and body, of which Chriſt's

Chriſt's human nature is compoſed, acquired no perſonality, till it was applied to the individual perſon of the Son of God, whoſe nature it then became; it muſt then neceſſarily acquire perſonality, or become a perſon; otherwiſe, it never was a perſon at all: well then, the ſoul and body of Chriſt, when applied to the individual perſon of the Son of God, muſt be one perſon; and the Son of God, by which you muſt mean the divine Perſon, is another Perſon, unleſs you ſuppoſe that the Son of God loſt his perſonality, by acquiring the perſonality of the ſoul and body of Chriſt: for if he did not, the abſurdity ſtill remains; Chriſt is an intelligent being, conſiſting of two perſons, which abſurdity, cannot be evaded any other way than by ſuppoſing, that the one was ſwallowed up by the other, in which caſe, the diſtinction of the two natures will not anſwer thoſe important purpoſes, for which this famous diſtinction was firſt invented by learned men. You labour to prove that Chriſt, though he be perfect God and perfect man, is yet but one Perſon, and at the ſame time your proof neceſſarily ſuppoſes two Perſons.

O my Father, if it be poſſible, let this cup paſs from me: is it poſſible for common ſenſe to imagine, that Chriſt, when he made this humble addreſs to the Father, had really a divine nature equal to that of the Father, and conſequently, had as much power to help himſelf as the Father? Is it poſſible, I ſay, for any unprejudiced perſon, who had never heard of the Athanaſian doctrine, to believe that the word, *me*, does not refer to his whole perſon, but only his human ſoul, in diſtinction to his divine nature? To ſuppoſe the Son of God, when he was upon earth, to be aſſiſted by the Spirit of God; and at the ſame time to ſup-

poſe, that he was ſupreme God himſelf, and equally poſſeſſed of divine power with the Father, is ſuch a groſs and palpable contradiction, as diſintereſted Chriſtians could not poſſibly ſwallow down, if they exerted thoſe reaſonable powers which God hath given them.

As you are obliged to ſay ſomething, you maintain that "Chriſt, whilſt he underwent his voluntary humiliation upon earth, ſuſpended the exertion of his divine power, and left it to his humanity to ſpeak and act agreeable to the feelings of human nature:" that is, Chriſt had no real occaſion to apply to the Father, as being equally powerful with him; but yet he choſe to ſpeak and act, as if he was poſſeſſed of no ſuch divine perfection.

Anſ. The grand difficulty ſtill remains; it ſeems very unaccountable that the human nature of Chriſt, which was united in the divinity, ſhould make an earneſt ſupplication to the perſon of the Father, when its own divinity was ſo near at hand, and which was equally capable of affording all requiſite aſſiſtance. You are obliged to ſuppoſe, that Chriſt ſuſpended the exertion of his divine power, though you offer no reaſon for your ſuppoſition. The truth is, without this ſuppoſition, which has no ſupport either from Scripture or reaſon, your cauſe is abſolutely demoliſhed.

You conclude this head with obſerving, "that the Son of God came down from heaven; he is called God in the higheſt ſenſe; he aſſumed alſo perfect human nature; he ſuffered, *&c.* But God cannot ſuffer, his human nature, therefore, only ſuffered, and ſpoke, and acted, what was unſuitable for God to ſuffer, ſpeak, or do. Theſe are undeniable and plain conſequences from Scripture." Page 106.

Anſ.

Anſ. We are agreed, that the Son of God came down from heaven: but as to his being called God in the higheſt ſenſe, I have fully and clearly proved the contrary. And with reſpect to a perfect human nature joined to the divinity, it has juſt appeared, that the Scripture account is inconſiſtent with this notion. We read that Chriſt had a body prepared for him, and ſo became a real man; but that Chriſt is a being compoſed of a divine nature, ſoul, and body, the Scripture no where declares, and ſeveral paſſages expreſsly contradict it. The notion of Chriſt's divine and human nature being demoliſhed, it neceſſarily follows, that Chriſt ſuffered in his higheſt capacity, according to the plain language and ſentiment of Scripture; from whence his inferiority to the one ſupreme God, is eſtabliſhed upon the ſtrongeſt foundation, it being on all ſides agreed, that God, the ſupreme God, cannot ſuffer. See the Appeal, *&c.* 2d edit. p. 57.

I come now to examine what you have offered, to invalidate the Scripture account delivered in the Appeal, concerning the Holy Spirit.

From a collection of the principal paſſages relating to the bleſſed Spirit, are deduced ſuch obſervations as ſeem naturally to ariſe from them; namely, that he was the immediate worker of all miracles, even of thoſe done by our Lord himſelf, during his ſtate of humiliation, *&c.* and it is likewiſe argued, that the Holy Spirit is a perſon inferior to almighty God, becauſe he is repreſented as proceeding from him, ſent by him, and acting in all things, according to his ſupreme will and pleaſure. In your anſwer, you draw a quite different concluſion from the ſame premiſes, in which, as Chriſtians, we are agreed.

"You argue that the Holy Spirit, because he acts in all things according to the will and pleasure of God, must not only be competently qualified, perfectly to know and understand his will and pleasure; but he must actually have power in himself, sufficient to perform whatever works the divine will and pleasure direct. But it is manifest, the works ascribed to the Holy Spirit, require no less than almighty power to perform them. The Holy Spirit, therefore, must have this power in himself, however acquired; and consequently, as to actual possession of such power, be upon an equal footing with any other person whatsoever, possessed of the same power." Page 107.

Anſ. Very true; when almighty God employs any particular agent in any office, he furnishes him with sufficient powers to perform it. But is it not very strange, that you should infer from hence, that the Holy Spirit has these powers in himself, and is upon an equal footing with almighty God, when it is expressly said, that the Holy Spirit is sent by him, given by him, and ministers to his will in all things? This way of arguing will equally prove, that Moses and the Apostles had actually the power in themselves of working miracles, and so were equal to God: for certain it is that they actually possessed the power, and so, according to your express assertion, were upon an equal footing with any other person whatsoever possessed of the same power. Whether the works ascribed to the Holy Spirit, require an almighty power to perform them, may be justly questioned. We are not sufficiently qualified to determine, what degrees of power God can communicate to inferior beings. He certainly can impart any power to inferior beings, that does not imply

imply a contradiction. But admitting, that ſome of the miracles recorded in the Goſpel, namely, raiſing the dead, cannot be done by the utmoſt power of any inferior agent; how does it follow that God cannot employ an inferior agent in the operation, though it be granted that the inferior being had originally no ſuch power? So that upon ſuppoſition that ſome of the miracles aſcribed to the bleſſed Spirit, require an almighty power, this is no proof that he is an almighty Perſon, and upon a footing with God, becauſe we are plainly aſſured that he had originally no ſuch power, as being given him by God, and he only was employed as an inferi r miniſter to the will of God. The Apoſtles themſelves, were inferior agents in raiſing the dead; and therefore, according to your way of arguing, they muſt have this extraordinary power in themſelves, however acquired; and conſequently, as to the poſſeſſion of ſuch power, they muſt be upon an equal footing with any other perſon whatſoever, poſſeſſed of the ſame power.

You obſerve in the next place, "that the Holy Spirit's being given, or ſent, doth not affect his equa ity with the giver, or ſender, as you have ſhewn above, concerning the Son." Page 107.

Anſ. I refer my readers to common ſenſe, and to what has been ſaid upon that article.

You then propoſe examining, "whether his being ſaid to proceed from God, takes away in any reſpect from his real divinity. And in order to determine this, you conſider the force of my interpretation of the words of St. Paul, 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11. *But God hath revealed them to us by his Spirit, for the Spirit ſearcheth all things, yea the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, ſave the Spirit of Man which is in him? Even ſo*

the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Upon this you obſerve, that it is not God taken abſolutely, that is here meant by the Apoſtle, but the perſon of God the Father, or God the Son, or both." Page 108.

Anſ. That the term, God, ſhould ſignify in this paſſage the Son, or the Father and Son, is contrary to the whole ſtrain of the New Teſtament, and is aſſerted without any ſort of evidence to ſupport it; and you are challenged to produce one clear paſſage, where the word, God, neceſſarily denotes Father and Son. God in this text, as obſerved in the Appeal, certainly means the Father.

Again, you obſerve, "that though it is not ſaid expreſsly in the text, that the Spirit is in God, as the Spirit of a Man, is in Man; yet certainly, it is ſtrongly and clearly implied: for the Apoſtle poſitively declares, that thoſe things which otherwiſe could not be known, and therefore were known only to God, God hath revealed to us by his Spirit. And that we may be ſure, that this revelation by the Spirit is an immediate revelation from God, he aſſigns this reaſon, *The Spirit ſearcheth all things without any exception, even the deep things of God:* from whence it is plain, that all the moſt ſecret councils of God are ſearched out by, and intimately known to the Spirit; and conſequently, the knowledge of this Spirit, is as infinite and extenſive as the knowledge of God." Pages 108, 109.

Anſ. That the Holy Spirit, as being employed by God in the important office of revelation, is more intimately acquainted with the ſecrets of God, regarding the Goſpel diſpenſation, than any other Spirit of the heavenly Hoſt (the Son excepted), may be juſtly inferred from this declaration of the

Apoſtle.

Apoſtle. But when you collect from hence, that the knowledge of the Spirit, is as infinite as that of God, you evidently miſtake the Apoſtle's words; *all things, even the deep things of God*, muſt neceſſarily be interpreted agreeably to the ſcope of the diſcourſe, which treats preciſely of thoſe things we know by revelation. As therefore the Spirit was employed by God, to communicate the knowledge of theſe things to men; ſo upon this account, the Spirit is juſtly ſaid, to *ſearch all things, even the deep things of God*, that is, things relating to the Goſpel diſpenſation; and conſequently the Spirit's univerſal knowledge, is not rightly deduced from this declaration of the Apoſtle.

You go on to argue from the Apoſtle's compariſon, "that the only foundation of the Holy Spirit's knowledge, muſt be that of his being as truly in God, as the Spirit of a Man, is in Man; otherwiſe, the compariſon fails." Page 109.

Anſ. The true foundation of the Spirit's extraordinary knowledge is evidently this: God hath imparted to him his ſecret councils, relating to the ſalvation of men, and he above all other angelic miniſters, has received a commiſſion to reveal them to men; and conſequently, the knowledge of the Spirit, does not imply his being in God, as the Spirit of Man, is in Man. If the Apoſtle had intended to deliver the doctrine you contend for, he would have expreſt himſelf thus: *For what man knoweth the things of a man, ſave the ſpirit of a man which is in him? Even ſo the things of God knoweth no one, but the Spirit which is in God*; inſtead of this the Apoſtle ſays, *the Spirit of God*; and in the next verſe, the Spirit is ſtill more remarkably diſtinguiſhed from God; *the Spirit which*

is of God, or cometh forth from God, which undeniably proves, that the Spirit is not only diſtinguiſhed from God, but is inferior to him.

You endeavour to remove an obvious objection, ariſing from your interpretation, namely, that then the Father and his Spirit are one perſon, juſt as the ſoul and body make one perſon. Your ſolution is this: "As the Spirit of a Man, which is in Man, is diſtinct from the bodily ſubſtance of the ſame Man; ſo the perſon of the Holy Spirit, which is in the Godhead, is diſtinct from the perſons of the Father and Son, which yet are in the ſame Godhead; the diſtinction and union of the latter, being as certain as the diſtinction and union of the former, and both equally incomprehenſible. When therefore, it is ſaid of a man, he knoweth, or revealeth his thoughts by his ſpirit; it is equally proper to ſay, the ſpirit of that man knoweth, or revealeth his thoughts; though the ſpirit, or bodily ſubſtance of that man, be two diſtinct ſubſtances. In the ſame manner alſo, when it is ſaid of God, that he revealeth any thing by his Spirit, it is equally proper to ſay, the Spirit of God revealeth the ſame thing, though the perſon of the Spirit, and the perſons of the Father and Son be three diſtinct perſons; for though none of them can perform any divine action, without the aſſiſtance of the divine nature, inſeparable from each perſon, and conſequently, without the concurrence of each other; and though any one of them ſingly, may therefore, notwithſtanding, be underſtood to repreſent the entire Godhead; yet from the acknowledged diſtinction of the perſonal properties, whereby they are otherwiſe ſeverally deſcribed, it is equally evident they cannot be one and the ſelf-ſame perſon; juſt as the body and ſpirit of a man, muſt

muſt be acknowledged to be different ſubſtances, though neither of them can perform any action, without the mutual aſſiſtance of each other, and though either of them ſingly, is often underſtood to mean the whole man." Page 109, 110.

Anſ. This ſolution, contains a ſpecimen of ſome of thoſe ſubtle diſtinctions mentioned in the Appeal. I ſhould be glad to have ſome tolerable account, what is the preciſe notion of the Godhead, as diſtinguiſhed from Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, which I own, I never could yet meet with. The term, Godhead, according to your illuſtration, ſeems to anſwer the bodily ſubſtance of a man, and then Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, anſwer to the ſpirit of this bodily ſubſtance. If this be your meaning, your illuſtration ſtands thus: as man is a being compoſed of ſpirit and body; ſo God is a being compoſed of an Eſſence, ſtiled the Godhead, and of three perſons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt: and as the ſoul and body of a man make one perſon; ſo the Godhead, conſiſting of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt make, what? one would naturally expect, one Perſon, if the illuſtration was pertinent, but your argument requires you to ſay, three Perſons, which demonſtrates the falſhood of the compariſon. A being conſiſting of ſoul and body, which makes one perſon, cannot poſſibly illuſtrate the nature of a being, which conſiſts of three perſons. Again, if your meaning be, that the Spirit of God anſwers to the ſpirit of man, and the perſons of Father and Son anſwer to the bodily ſubſtance of man, your illuſtration will ſtand thus: as the ſoul and body muſt be acknowledged to be different ſubſtances, though they conſtitute one perſon; ſo though the Spirit, and Father, and Son, muſt be deemed

deemed what? you will not allow them to be different ſubſtances, yet they conſtitute what? not one perſon, but three perſons You maintain, that the ſoul and body are different ſubſtances, and certain it is, that they conſtitute one perſon; from whence you infer, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, as they have diſtinct properties, cannot be one and the ſame perſon: but ſurely, their having diſtinct properties, can no more make them diſtinct perſons, than a man's having diſtinct ſubſtances, can make him more than one man, upon ſuppoſition that your compariſon ſtrictly holds. In a word, you introduce the utmoſt confuſion, upon account of this compariſon, which taken in your ſenſe, proves ſomething quite contrary to what you intend to eſtabliſh. You ſeem to imagine that, becauſe a perſon may be compounded of ſeveral diſtinct ſubſtances, therefore a being may likewiſe be compounded of ſeveral diſtinct perſons, which is exactly the ſame abſurdity, as to affirm that, becauſe a man may be compounded of ſpirit, fleſh and bones, therefore a man may likewiſe be compounded of many men, ſo that any number of men may be one man, or any number of perſons one being.

You take it for granted, that becauſe neither ſoul nor body, can perform any human action without the mutual aſſiſtance of each other, therefore, neither Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, can perform any divine action, without the concurrence of each other: whereas the Scripture uniformly declares and profeſſes the Father to be the one ſupreme Lord of heaven and earth, who acts in all things according to the council of his own will, and all other perſons always act in ſubjection to his will. To imagine that the one ſupreme God

God could not have created and governed the world, without the concurrence of the Son and Holy Spirit, merely becauſe it is revealed, that he thought fit to employ them in higher offices than other beings, is a thought highly injurious to the ſupreme authority, of the one God and Father of all. You may as well argue, that God could not have delivered the Children of Iſrael without the concurrence of Moſes, nor have propagated the Goſpel without the concurrence of the Apoſtles. I make no doubt of freely declaring, that the ſupreme Lord of the univerſe, was under no obligation ariſing from any neceſſary relation to the Son and Holy Spirit, to employ them in the work of man's ſalvation; but he might have accompliſhed the ſame end by other inſtruments, if it had been agreeable to his infinite wiſdom. In truth, what you have aſſumed depends upon this foundation, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are as ſtrictly one being, as ſoul and body, are one man; and that theſe three diſtinct perſons, are alſo equal in all eſſential perfections, the falſhood of which foundation, has been demonſtrated in theſe papers.

Your concluſion from the whole is this: "whatever is in God, muſt partake of the nature of God: but the Holy Spirit is in God; therefore, the Holy Spirit partakes of the nature of God." The major propoſition may be allowed to be true; but the minor propoſition, namely, that the Holy Spirit is in God, is abſolutely falſe, he being conſtantly diſtinguiſhed from God, and expreſsly ſaid to be given and ſent by him, and to proceed, or come forth, from him; which deſcription of the Holy Spirit, plainly demonſtrates the infinite abſurdity of your ſcheme: for how could God give, or ſend himſelf, which muſt be the caſe, if the

Holy

Holy Spirit partakes of the nature of God? It is no where ſaid in Scripture, that the Holy Spirit is in God; ſo that your propoſition which is aſſumed for truth, has no foundation in Scripture, either in word or ſenſe; and conſequently, your concluſion muſt be falſe, as depending upon a falſe propoſition.

I agree with you, that as the Spirit is ſaid to be the Spirit of God, becauſe he is of God, or proceedeth from God; ſo likewiſe, he is the Spirit of the Son for the ſame reaſon, namely, becauſe he is ſent by the Son, or cometh forth from him, which is the true meaning of the Spirit proceeding: but I am obliged to differ immediately, when you conclude from hence, the "unity of the three Perſons in the Godhead, equal in nature, though ſubordinate in rank and order, one God bleſſed for ever." *Anſ.* The contrary doctrine may be juſtly inferred from this deſcription: for if the Holy Spirit proceedeth, or cometh forth, or is ſent out, from the Father, he is certainly, according to common ſenſe, inferior to the Father; and if he was ſent by the Son, he is inferior to the Son. It is remarkable that, whilſt you are labouring to prove the three Perſons equal, you are obliged to make a conceſſion, that overthrows the notion of equality, namely, that the Son and Holy Spirit are ſubordinate in rank and order; if they are ſubordinate in rank and order, they are ſurely ſubordinate in *ſome* reſpect: but how to make this conſiſtent with co-equality and co-eternity, that is, an equality in *all* reſpects, muſt be left to thoſe who ſeem determined to defend palpable contradictions.

Acts v. 3, 4. In the Appeal is given, the only rational and conſiſtent interpretation of theſe texts, which

which are uſually produced to ſhew, that the Holy Spirit is ſtiled God. The ſenſe there given, is likewiſe confirmed by other parallel texts. See An Appeal, *&c.* 2d edit. p. 61.

In oppoſition to this you maintain, "that the Holy Spirit is ſtiled God, becauſe the lie is here uttered immediately to the Apoſtles: but they, as men, could not diſcover this: the Holy Spirit then reveals it to them; and conſequently, the power of knowing the hearts of men, which elſewhere is deſcribed as the peculiar attribute of God, is here aſcribed to the Holy Spirit." Page 111.

Anſ. That the Apoſtles, as men, could not diſcover the hearts of Ananias and Sapphira; and likewiſe, that they were enabled by the Holy Spirit to make this diſcovery, is true: but when you infer from hence the Godhead of the Holy Spirit, you are expreſsly contradicted by Scripture evidence; which has determined, that God employed, ſent, and gave the Holy Spirit to perform ſuch offices for the benefit of the church; ſo that whatever powers the Holy Spirit imparted to the Apoſtles, they were derived from the one ſupreme God and Father of all, the original donor and benefactor. See Appeal, 2d edit. p. 46, 47. and above p. 188—190.

You go on to obſerve: "But wherein does the Apoſtle place the aggravation of Ananias's crime? Is it not in that he lied not to men, but to God? If then the Holy Spirit is not the ſame here with God, he no more lied to the Holy Spirit, than he did to the Apoſtles: for if it is ſaid he did not lie to them, becauſe they of themſelves could not diſcern the fraud; ſo it might be equally ſaid, that he did not lie to the Holy Spirit, becauſe he neither of himſelf could diſcern the fraud. But it

is

is expreſsly ſaid, he lied to the Holy Spirit, and not to the Apoſtles; the foundation then of the Holy Spirit's diſcernment, muſt be quite different from that of the Apoſtles. But it can in no other way differ, but in his having this power in himſelf; and if in himſelf, he muſt be truly God." Pages 111, 112.

Anſ. The aggravation of Ananias's crime doubtleſs conſiſted in this, that he lied not to men, but to God. But you quite miſtake the meaning of the expreſſion, when you infer that he did not lie to the Apoſtles at all: for the ſenſe is not abſolute, as it ſeems at firſt view, but, according to the nature of the Jewiſh language, it evidently means, thou haſt not ſo much lied to us, as to God himſelf, whoſe ſervants we are. To confirm this interpretation by a few inſtances; Hoſ. vi. 6. *I deſired mercy, and not ſacrifice:* the meaning cannot poſſibly be, that God did not require ſacrifice at all, but he rather choſe mercy, than ſacrifice. Matth. xv. 24. *I am not ſent*, ſaith our Saviour, *but to the loſt ſheep of the Houſe of Iſrael:* but it could not be our Lord's intention to affirm, that he was not ſent to any but Jews, he being evidently deſigned, *To be a Light to lighten the Gentiles, as well as to be a glory of his people Iſrael*; but that he was not ſent ſo immediately, and ſo principally to any other nation, as to the loſt ſheep of the Houſe of Iſrael. [Compare Jerem. vii. 22. Ezek. xx. 25.] Though the lie was told to the Apoſtles, and ſo to the Spirit of God dwelling in them, yet the principal object of the lie was, God himſelf who had given them the Spirit, which fully accounts for the form of the expreſſion. When therefore, you ſay, that if the Holy Spirit is not the ſame here with God, he no more lied to the Holy Spirit than he

did

did to the Apoſtles; all that follows from hence is, that the Holy Spirit is not the principal object, it was not ſo much a lie to the Apoſtles, or the Holy Spirit, as to God. Again, as to your obſervation, that it is expreſsly ſaid, he lied to the Holy Spirit, and not to the Apoſtles; this I have already obviated, by explaining the form of the expreſſion, which was not intended to deny, that Ananias lied at all to the Apoſtle's; and this deſtroys the force of the compariſon, you make between the Apoſtles and the Holy Spirit, as if it had been declared, that Ananias did not lie to the Apoſtles, becauſe they could not of themſelves diſcern the fraud, and that he did lie to the Holy Spirit, becauſe he could diſcern it, and had this power of diſcernment in himſelf, which proves him to be truly God. Whatever powers the Holy Spirit poſſeſſed, they were derived from God, as obſerved above, and conſequently, he muſt be a perſon inferior to God *.

The texts produced in the Appeal, as parallel to Acts v. 3, 4. appear to me ſtrictly ſo, notwithſtanding your objections.

Acts xxiii. 9. *If a Spirit, or Angel, hath ſpoken to him, let us not fight againſt God.* Upon this you obſerve, that "to make the Spirit, or Angel, here in the ſame manner to be ſtiled God, it muſt be

* It is obſervable, that the form of the expreſſion in the 3d verſe, is different from that in the 4th, viz. ψευσασθαι has an Accuſative caſe in the former, and a Dative in the latter. Now in Greek authors, ψευδομαι, with an Accuſative caſe ſignifieth, to bely, pretend, or counterfeit; and then the ſenſe is this: Why hath Satan filled thine heart to bely the Holy Spirit, or to father that action upon him, which was ſuggeſted by the evil Spirit? According to this interpretation, it is not expreſsly ſaid, that Ananias lied to the Holy Spirit at all.

proved that the Spirit, or Angel, ſpoke from his own authority." Page 112.

Anſ. In order to prove that this text is not parallel, you muſt ſhew that the Holy Spirit acted by his own authority; a point you have taken for granted, without proof, it being expreſsly contrary to Scripture, the Holy Spirit being repreſented as ſent and given by God, and conſequently, he did not act by his own authority.

Again, Luke x. 16. *He that deſpiſeth you, deſpiſeth me; and he that deſpiſeth me, deſpiſeth him that ſent me.* You obſerve, "that here indeed is a manifeſt ſubordination implied, of the Diſciples to Chriſt, and of Chriſt to his Father. But is there the leaſt oppoſition implied? Whereas in the caſe of Ananias, there is a clear oppoſition between the Holy Spirit and man, and between God and man; but not the leaſt ſubordination even ſo much as hinted: both caſes therefore muſt be utterly unlike in every reſpect.

Anſ. According to this declaration, a perſon who deſpiſes the Apoſtles, does by this act deſpiſe Chriſt, and he that deſpiſes Chriſt, does in effect deſpiſe the Father that ſent him. Common ſenſe determines, that this paſſage in the Acts, is exactly parallel: Ananias by telling a lie to the Apoſtles, did in effect lie to the Holy Spirit, and lying to the Holy Spirit, was the very ſame thing as lying to God himſelf, who gave them the Holy Spirit. As to the oppoſition between the Holy Spirit and man, and between God and man, which ſeems at firſt view to be implied, in the form of the expreſſion, I have already proved, that no oppoſition was intended. And as to a ſubordination, it is certainly implied in this, that God is repreſented as the principal object of the lie,

lie, as being told to the Apoſtles and the Holy Spirit his immediate miniſters.

1 Theſſ. iv. 8. *He that deſpiſeth, deſpiſeth not man, but God, who alſo hath given unto us his Holy Spirit.* Upon this you obſerve, "that the act of contempt firſt mentioned, if it affects any one at all, muſt immediately affect the Holy Spirit; and yet in the repetition it is ſaid, not to affect man at all, but directly God. But this direct and immediate application of the contempt to God, makes the contempt of the Holy Spirit as ſtrong and as heinous, as the contempt of God.——Here then the real divinity of the Holy Spirit is plainly implied; and conſequently, the term, *God*, cannot be taken abſolutely, but perſonally to denote either Father, or Son, which at once overthrows the force of this inſtance: for the diſtinction here holds only between the perſon of the Holy Spirit and the perſon of either Father, or Son; and not between the Holy Spirit and God abſolutely, as you pretend it doth in the caſe of Ananias; which therefore makes a wide difference. But if you ſhould deny that the words, *he that deſpiſeth*, affect the Holy Spirit, there is then not the leaſt ſimilitude between the two caſes."

Anſ. The act of contempt firſt mentioned, *he that deſpiſeth*, does not refer to the Holy Spirit, but to the precepts of the apoſtle relating to purity, the neceſſity of which he had been inculcating in oppoſition to debaucheries of every ſort: he that deſpiſeth theſe precepts of an apoſtle, deſpiſeth not man, but God who hath alſo given unto us his Holy Spirit; that is, he does not ſo much deſpiſe me who am a man, as God himſelf, who hath given to us (his apoſtles) his Holy Spirit. When you infer from this declaration the divinity

of the Holy Spirit, and that the term *God* ſignifies either Father, or Son, this only proves your prevailing inclination to ſee the point you aim at, whenever the leaſt colour appears, which can ſcarce be ſaid of the preſent inſtance. Common ſenſe loudly proteſts againſt the ſupreme divinity of a perſon, who is expreſsly declared to be given by God: and to imagine that God in this paſſage ſhould ſignify the perſon of the Son, is contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture, the Father being the perſon, who is always denoted by ſuch expreſſions; *God ſent his Son, God hath given the Holy Spirit.* And though *he that deſpiſeth*, has no immediate reference to the Holy Spirit, yet the caſe in this text is directly parallel to Acts v. 3, 4. God is here plainly repreſented as the principal object of contempt, though St. Paul was the perſon immediately affected; and the reaſon aſſigned is the ſame, becauſe he was inſpired with the Spirit of God; juſt as Ananias by lying to the apoſtle Peter who was inſpired with the Spirit, did in effect lie to God himſelf, who gave him his Spirit. *

With reſpect to our body being ſtiled the temple of the Holy Ghoſt, from whence it has been argued that the Holy Ghoſt is God, as a temple is peculiarly dedicated to God, I ſet down the texts relating to this point. See Appeal, &c. p. 61. 2d edit. You refer me to an attentive conſideration of 2 Cor. vi. 16. *and what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God, as God hath ſaid, I will dwell in them, and walk in them, and I will be their God,*

* N. B That part of the paragraph laſt cited, which is left out, is anſwered above.

an

and they ſhall be my people. Upon this you obſerve that "God is expreſsly ſaid to dwell in us, and as we are elſewhere expreſsly ſaid to be the temple of the Holy Spirit, he muſt therefore be the living God. It is an abſurdity to make a creature the repreſentative of God in us: for then the Holy Spirit muſt be no more than an idol." p. 114.

Anſ. In what ſenſe God dwells in us, is explained by the texts quoted in the Appeal., 1 Cor. iii. 16. *Ye are the temple of God, for the Spirit of God dwelleth in you.* 1 John iii. 24. St. John proves that *God abideth in us by the Spirit which he hath given us.* Chap. iv. 13. *By this we know that we abide in him and he in us, becauſe he hath given us of his Spirit.* This is the plain Scripture account of God's dwelling in us; where the Spirit of God is, there God is ſaid to be, and that is his temple, where his Spirit hath fixed his abode. On the other hand, your way of arguing tends to prove that the Holy Spirit muſt be an idol, unleſs he be ſupreme God. It really grieves one to conſider what lengths men will run, when they are determined to maintain a favourite point. I muſt remind you, that it is the ſolemn determination of St. Paul, that the ſupreme God cannot poſſibly have any thing *given to him*, and conſequently cannot be *given* himſelf, by any other being: (ſee above and Appeal, &c. 2 edit. p. 32.) But God is ſaid to dwell in us, becauſe he hath *given us his Holy Spirit*; and therefore the Holy Spirit is not ſupreme God: from whence you infer that he muſt be an idol; which charge muſt fall upon the ſacred writers. It is certainly your duty, as a ſincere chriſtian, to reflect ſeriouſly upon ſuch impious aſſertions; which put an idol ſet up by the

authority of man upon the ſame footing with the Holy Spirit, who is expreſsly appointed by God to aſſiſt us, unleſs he be acknowledged to be ſupreme God, in oppoſition to the ſolemn declarations of holy Scripture.

With reſpect to 1 Cor. iii. 16. 1 John iii. 24.—iv. 13. you obſerve that the "Spirit is deſcribed as the actual inhabitant: from whence you conclude that we are immediately the temple of the Holy Spirit: and how then of God, if this Spirit is not, as the apoſtle declares, the Spirit of God; and therefore in God, as the ſpirit of a man is in man; and conſequently, partaking of the ſame nature with Father and Son, God himſelf." p. 115.

Anſ. Though the Spirit be in ſome ſenſe the actual inhabitant, and we are immediately the temple of the Holy Spirit; yet the ſacred writers have taken particular care to direct our thoughts to God, to whom our bodies are principally dedicated. We are directed to make our ſolemn acknowledgments to God the ſupreme benefactor and giver of the Holy Spirit; which plainly ſhews that the Spirit is not only diſtinguiſhed from God, but inferior to him. When you infer that the Spirit of God muſt be in God, as the ſpirit of a man is in man, and conſequently, partaking of the ſame nature with the Father and Son; this is not warranted by Scripture, and indeed naturally tends to the Sabellian notion of making the Father, Son, and Spirit as different modes of the ſame Being. Again, when you infer, if the Spirit be not in God, and conſequently God, God could not be ſaid to dwell in us; you are expreſsly contradicted by the general tenor of the ſacred writings, wherein God is frequently ſaid to do what is really done

by inferior inſtruments. God may properly be ſaid to dwell in us, becauſe he hath given the Holy Spirit to dwell in us.

As to 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20. quoted in the Appeal, you labour to prove, "that the word, *God*, ſignifies the Son, and that theſe texts by plain inference, prove the divinity of the Holy Spirit. The term, *God*, ſignifies Chriſt, becauſe we are ſaid to be bought with a price, which expreſſion occurs in the next chapter, and is neceſſarily referred to Chriſt, who is mentioned in the verſe foregoing. Chap. vii. 22, 23. from whence too it might ſeem to follow, that by the term, *God*, in the next verſe the apoſtle directly means Chriſt. Ver. 24. *Brethren, let every man wherein he is called, therein abide with God*, that is, let him abide the ſervant of God, who immediately before was called the ſervant of Chriſt." p. 114, 115.

Anſ. The word, *God*, in this conſtruction never ſignifies the Son, and the reaſon you give for it in this paſſage, is fallacious: a chriſtian may be properly ſaid to be the ſervant of Chriſt and of God, as Chriſt is appointed by God head of the church, and our Lord and Maſter in ſpiritual affairs; ſo that chriſtians are dedicated to the ſervice of God and of Chriſt. This expreſſion, *ye are bought with a price*, doubtleſs refers to the precious blood of Chriſt; but how does it follow from hence, that God in the former verſe ſignifies Chriſt? Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghoſt, which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? for ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body and in your ſpirit, which are God's. St. Paul was exhorting the Corinthians to avoid fornication; and the argument here made uſe of, is drawn from the

nature of their chriſtian profeſſion: as God hath graciouſly beſtowed upon chriſtians the favour of the Holy Spirit, whereby their body is entitled to the honour of being his temple; it is inconſiſtent with this dignity for chriſtians to defile their body with impure gratifications. Again, as chriſtians were redeemed by the precious blood of Chriſt, they are not at their own diſpoſal, but are bound to glorify God with their body as well as ſoul, they being both God's peculiar property, who ſent his Son into the world to lay down his life for them. Thus in exact agreement with the ſcripture doctrine of the Trinity, our ſanctification by the Spirit, and redemption by Chriſt, are diſtinctly ſet forth; and at the ſame time the ſupremacy of the one God and Father of all is carefully ſecured, he being repreſented as the original Donor of the Spirit, and the ſupreme Benefactor, whom we are principally bound to acknowledge for our redemption by the Son. That the word, *God*, in ver. 19. ſhould ſignify the Son, and in the 20th Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, (as you infer in the next paragraph, p. 115.) is inconſiſtent with the whole tenor of Scripture, and renders the apoſtle's argument palpably abſurd. Your favourite concluſion, namely, that God ſignifies three perſons, verſe 20. depends upon the ſuppoſition, that God, verſe 19. denotes the Son; from whence you infer that "chriſtians are the temple of the Son as well as of the Father by being the temple of their Holy Spirit; and conſequently, that theſe three perſons are partakers of the ſame nature: and therefore the apoſtle exhorts chriſtians to glorify God, the three perſons altogether." p. 115. *Anſ.* As your whole ſcheme is founded upon the notion of God denoting three perſons, I add to what has

has been already obſerved, that the term, *God*, in this chapter occurs nine times, and, according to the uſual ſtile of St. Paul in all his diſcourſes and epiſtles, it ſignifies the Father, it being not certain that he has given the title of God to the Son even in one undoubted paſſage: particularly in this chapter God is expreſsly diſtinguiſhed from the Son, and Holy Spirit. Ver. 11. *Ye are juſtified by the name of the Lord Jeſus, and by the Spirit of our God.* Ver. 14. *God hath raiſed up the Lord*, Surely *the Spirit of our God*, and *the Holy Ghoſt which ye have of God*, convey the ſame ſentiment with regard to God, and the Spirit. But God in the 11th verſe, according to your own rule, neceſſarily means the Father, and conſequently God in the 19th verſe ſignifies the ſame perſon. Again, it is infinitely abſurd to imagine, that God in the 20th verſe ſhould denote three perſons, in expreſs contradiction to St. Paul's ſolemn determination upon ſome occaſions; in defiance to every text through all his epiſtles in which God is mentioned; and in oppoſition to the conſtant uſe of the word, *God*, by the other ſacred writers; for you muſt be frequently reminded, that you cannot produce one paſſage, where God neceſſarily conveys the notion of three perſons.

As to Epheſ. ii. 21, 22. which I quoted in the Appeal, you obſerve that the words of the apoſtle, ver. 18, &c. will ſet this matter in the cleareſt light. Let it then be carefully reviewed, becauſe you complain of my having maimed the ſenſe, by omitting what I thought not neceſſary for the point in hand. Ver. 18. *For through him* (namely Chriſt) *we both have an acceſs by one Spirit unto the Father.* Here doubtleſs the three perſons are plainly diſtinguiſhed, and the language

and ſentiment of this declaration clearly point out the ſupremacy of the Father, and the inferior agency of Chriſt and the Holy Spirit. For if Jews and Gentiles have acceſs to the Father through Chriſt, and through, or by, the Holy Spirit, it neceſſarily follows that the Father is the ſupreme and ultimate object; and that Chriſt and the Holy Spirit are employed as inferior agents in accompliſhing this important deſign. You endeavour to evade this plain declaration of the apoſtle by referring to 14, 15, 16, and 17th verſes immediately preceding, "where he recounts ſeveral acts of Chriſt; in which as he is plainly the chief agent, ſo in that one of aboliſhing the law, which is directly attributed to him, his almighty power manifeſtly appears; ſince none but God can repeal what God had before appointed." p. 116.

Anſ. True, what is eſtabliſhed by divine authority, cannot be repealed but by the ſame authority which enacted it. God was the author of the Jewiſh law, but Moſes was the perſon by whoſe immediate miniſtry it was delivered to the Jews: in like manner God was the author of the chriſtian covenant, by virtue of which the ceremonial law was aboliſhed; but Chriſt was the immediate miniſter who effected it by an authority derived from God; and conſequently, the abolition of the ceremonial law by Chriſt, no more proves him to be ſupreme God, than the eſtabliſhment of it proves Moſes to be ſupreme God. I would be underſtood ſo far only as this act of authority is concerned; becauſe I profeſs Chriſt to be ſuperior to Moſes in other reſpects, and even to the angels and the Holy Spirit, as being next in dignity to God himſelf. Chriſt indeed may be juſtly deemed a principal agent in bringing men to the know-

ledge

ledge of God, with reſpect to other inferior agents; but to put Chriſt upon a footing with God, from whom his whole merit is derived, and on whom it depends, is inconſiſtent with common ſenſe.

You now proceed to conſider the 19th, 20th, 21ſt and 22d verſes of Epheſ. chap. ii. *Now therefore ye are no more ſtrangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the ſaints, and of the houſhold of God, and are built upon the foundation of the apoſtles and prophets, Jeſus Chriſt himſelf being the chief corner-ſtone; in whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord; in whom you alſo are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.* The deſign of this allegorical deſcription was, to repreſent Jews and Heathens converted to the faith of Chriſt, as one building or temple, of which the apoſtles and prophets laid the foundation, who firſt embraced the doctrine of Chriſt, and delivered it to others, and of which foundation Jeſus Chriſt was the chief corner ſtone; and that all others, both Jews and Gentiles, were the building raiſed upon that foundation: for this reaſon the apoſtle adds, ver. 21. *In whom all the building*, that is, in Chriſt as being the chief corner ſtone, all the other parts of this building are fitly joined together, *groweth unto an holy temple*, that is, this work by degrees riſes to an holy temple anſwering to the natural temple of Jeruſalem, in which God had his peculiar reſidence, and was rightly worſhipped: *in the Lord*, that is, in Chriſt, who is ſtiled Lord abſolutely, as his Father is abſolutely ſtiled God; *in the Lord* was added in order to diſtinguiſh this ſpiritual temple from the material temple at Jeruſalem. Thus we ſay, a brother in the Lord, to diſtinguiſh a ſpiritual brother from a natural one. *In the Lord* is indeed a re-

repetition, but this is not uncommon, ſee chap. i. 10—22. *In whom*, that is, Chriſt, *you alſo are builded together for an habitation* of God, that is, you Epheſians alſo conſtitute a part of this building with the other converts to chriſtianity, *through the Spirit*, for God dwells amongſt his people by the Spirit.

On the other ſide, you interpret Lord, in the 21ſt verſe, of the Spirit, which is not only contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture, but likewiſe to the expreſs ſentiment of the apoſtle in this particular paſſage: *in whom*, ver. 21. neceſſarily refers to Chriſt, as being the chief corner ſtone through whom the other parts of the building are joined together; and for the ſame reaſon *in whom*, ver. 22. which neceſſarily refers to Lord in the 21ſt verſe, ſignifies Chriſt, the ſame thing being applied to him with reſpect to the Epheſians making part of the building as the other converts; *in whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple; in whom you alſo are builded together for an habitation of God.* Your obſervation, that Chriſt cannot be repreſented as the chief corner ſtone of the building, and likewiſe the builder, has no weight; for as the building is ſaid to grow into a temple through Chriſt, this neceſſarily implies that Chriſt is not only the chief corner ſtone in the foundation, but likewiſe is conſidered as the builder of the temple. And whereas you aſſert that the Spirit in the laſt verſe is repreſented as the builder of the habitation of God, which means the temple; on the contrary, the apoſtle's expreſſion plainly repreſents Chriſt as the builder of the temple, wherein God dwells through the Spirit. You infer from the whole that "as God the Father inhabits this temple, which is

elſewhere ſtiled the temple of the Holy Spirit, and Chriſt is repreſented as the chief corner ſtone, this temple equally belongs to the three perſons, and therefore theſe three perſons are the one God." p. 118.

Anſ. In what ſenſe chriſtians are the temple of the Holy Spirit, and ſo of God, has been conſidered above. When you infer from this chapter, and particularly from the 18th, 19th, 20th, 21ſt, and 22d verſes that the three perſons are the one God, you might with equal reaſon infer, that the apoſtles, the Holy Spirit, Chriſt and the Father, are the one God; for the apoſtles are repreſented as the foundation of the temple, as well as Chriſt the chief corner ſtone. In truth the apoſtle has diſtinctly ſet forth Chriſt and the Holy Spirit as inferior agents, through whom Jews and Gentiles were brought to right notions of the Father: then he conſiders the chriſtian church as conſiſting of Jews and Gentiles, under the ſimilitude of a building or temple, of which the apoſtles by their preaching laid the foundation, and of which Chriſt is an eminent ſupport: and as God had his peculiar reſidence in the Jewiſh temple; ſo he dwells in this ſpiritual temple by the Holy Spirit, whom he ſent down upon the apoſtles and chriſtian church. Remarkable it is that God is diſtinguiſhed from Chriſt and the Spirit, which is abſolutely inconſiſtent with the notion of three perſons and one God. Nothing can ſhew the falſhood of your cauſe in a ſtronger light than your attempt to extract the Athanaſian doctrine from ſuch paſſages of Scripture; it being very evident that you would not have recourſe to far fetched deductions, if you were furniſhed with direct and poſitive proof.

Matth.

Matth. xii. 31, 32. Upon this you obſerve, "that the perſon of the Holy Spirit muſt be affected by this blaſphemy, becauſe he performed the works; and granting that he was employed, it by no means takes away from his property in his works; unleſs it could be ſhewn that he is no more than a neceſſary and a paſſive inſtrument in the hands of his employer. If therefore the Holy Spirit be not God, but a creature, it is impoſſible to ſhew that a ſin againſt a creature can be unpardonable; and conſequently, he muſt be acknowledged to be God upon the account of the unpardonable nature of this ſin." p. 118, 119.

Anſ. You grant that the very eſſence of this blaſphemy conſiſted in this, that the Jews acted in oppoſition to the cleareſt light: now this was an unpardonable affront againſt God himſelf, who had employed the Holy Spirit in theſe extraordinary operations. The caſe would have been exactly the ſame, the crime would have been attended with the ſame aggravating circumſtances, if God had employed any other inferior agent in theſe miraculous operations. It is not requiſite, that I ſhould prove the Holy Spirit a neceſſary inſtrument, in order to ſhew that he has not an abſolute property in the works which he performed; it is ſufficient for the purpoſe, that I ſhew from Scripture that the Holy Spirit is an inferior agent deriving his power and commiſſion from God; in which caſe blaſphemy againſt the Holy Spirit muſt be the moſt heinous affront offered to God himſelf, who made uſe of this method to afford mankind the higheſt conviction, and moſt ſatisfactory evidence of our Lord's divine commiſſion. And no reaſon can be aſſigned why this particular blaſphemy ſhould be declared unpardonable, but becauſe

it

it was done in oppoſition to the cleareſt light; and conſequently the works of the Holy Spirit, and not his perſon, are here conſidered; whatever affront may be implied againſt the perſon of the Holy Spirit, was neceſſarily directed againſt God himſelf, whoſe agent he was. Thus a ſevere threatning is denounced by our Lord againſt thoſe places and cities who rejected the preaching of the apoſtles, becauſe they were the inſtruments employed by God to communicate to men the glad tidings of the Goſpel, and could demonſtrate their commiſſion by miraculous works. To reject the preaching of the apoſtles, could not upon any other account be eſteemed inexcuſable, but becauſe it was done in oppoſition to ſufficient light and evidence, which was communicated to men by the apoſtles, and conſequently it was rejecting the authority of God himſelf, whoſe immediate miniſters the apoſtles were.

Acts xxviii. 25, 26, 27. compared with Iſa. vi. 9, 10.

You obſerve upon this compariſon, "that when the words, which in any of the prophets of the Old Teſtament are ſet forth as the immediate words of the Lord Jehovah, are yet as diſtinctly, and as immediately aſcribed to the Holy Spirit by the apoſtles in the New Teſtament, it muſt yield a moſt ſtrong conviction of the real divinity of the Holy Spirit: becauſe every ſuch proof acquires the force of two; and beſides, hath the immenſe advantage of an application and comment made by an interpreter, who cannot err." p. 119, 120.

Anſ. Doubtleſs the apoſtles were infallible interpreters of the Old Teſtament, as they were inſpired with the Spirit of God. But the queſtion is, whether St. Paul's view in citing this prophecy of

of Iſaiah, was to prove the Holy Ghoſt to be the Lord Jehovah. Now there is nothing in the text that points out any ſuch view, it being plainly deſigned to ſet forth the blindneſs of the Jewiſh people. In the 23d verſe we have an account of the apoſtle's preaching to the Jews, which by comparing with the hiſtory of the Acts undeniably conſiſted in this, to prove that Jeſus whom he preached was the Chriſt, that being the grand point which the apoſtles always laboured, when they preached to Jews, becauſe they already believed in one ſupreme God. And when ſome of the Jews believed not, St. Paul applied the words of the prophet Iſaiah to the unbelieving part of his Jewiſh audience. It plainly appears from hence, that the divinity of the Holy Ghoſt was not the point aimed at by the apoſtle; and in order to make the application of St. Paul any ſort of proof of the divinity of the Holy Spirit, it ſhould firſt be ſhewn that he had plainly in this or any other diſcourſe inculcated the notion you contend for; and then had cited the Old Teſtament in confirmation of what he had plainly and expreſsly declared himſelf. But this is ſo far from being the caſe, that we find an abſolute ſilence in all his diſcourſes upon the ſupreme divinity of the Holy Spirit; and therefore we may reaſonably have recourſe to another interpretation confirmed by parallel texts. The ſame argument here deduced to prove the Holy Spirit to be the Lord, will equally prove Moſes to be the Lord. Exod. xxxii. 11. *Lord, why doth thy wrath wax hot againſt thy people, which thou haſt brought forth out of the land of Egypt?* Verſe 7. *And the Lord ſaid to Moſes, get thee down; for thy people which thou haſt brought out of the land of Egypt*, &c. Here the very

ſame

ſame thing is attributed to the Lord and to Moſes, therefore it may be argued that Moſes is the Lord.

With regard to ſuch ſort of inſtances, you contend that they muſt be interpreted in a different manner; and it is remarkable that you appeal to common ſenſe for departing in ſuch caſes from an interpretation that would introduce groſs confuſion into the ſacred writings. But I muſt challenge it as my right to take the ſame liberty in the interpretation of Scripture that you find yourſelf obliged to uſe. We are expreſsly aſſured, that the prophets always ſpake by the inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt; ſo that if we meet with any paſſage, wherein God is repreſented as ſpeaking without the mention of the Holy Ghoſt, it may rationally and conſiſtently be ſuppoſed. Surely God may be ſaid to ſpeak, when the Holy Spirit, prophets, or apoſtles ſpake in the name of God. If God and the Holy Spirit be one Being, the apoſtle would moſt certainly have ſaid ſo in plain terms, and would not have left it to be inferred by ſuch conſequential arguings, as equally prove men to be the ſame being with God.

But you inſiſt upon it "that it is an abſurdity to ſuppoſe that God ſhould ſpeak and not ſpeak at the ſame time; beſides, it is falſe in fact, as appears from this one inſtance of Iſaiah, where the prophet repreſents an extraordinary viſion of the glory of the Lord of Hoſts; and the Lord whoſe glory he ſaw, immediately ſpeaking to him, without the leaſt mention of the Holy Spirit's interveening. So that to apply the words to the Holy Spirit as diſtinct from, and inferior to God, the prophet gives not the leaſt warrant." p. 120, 121.

Anſ.

Anſ. As to the ſuppoſed abſurdity of God's ſpeaking and not ſpeaking at the ſame time, the whole tenor of Scripture and common ſenſe plainly ſhew, that it is no abſurdity to aſcribe the words and actions of an angel or any inferior being to God himſelf, in whoſe name and by whoſe authority the inferior agent acts and ſpeaks. Beſides, it is the ſolemn determination of our Saviour, that the voice of the one ſupreme God was never heard; *Ye have neither heard his voice, nor ſeen his ſhape*; and conſequently, wherever God is deſcribed as ſpeaking, ſome inferior agent muſt neceſſarily be ſuppoſed as the ſpeaker in the name of God.

But in order to put an end to all poſſibility of cavilling, let the prophet's and the apoſtle's words be nicely compared. In the former, God is repreſented as ſpeaking theſe things to Iſaiah in a viſion; in the latter, it is ſaid, that the Holy Spirit ſpake them by Iſaiah to the fathers. Which two caſes any one may perceive are widely different, becauſe Iſaiah was the only perſon who heard theſe words in the viſion, as he received a commiſſion from God to deliver them to the people of Iſrael, and conſequently the people did not hear the words: whereas the apoſtle repreſents the Holy Spirit as ſpeaking the words by Iſaiah to the people; and the plain reaſon why the apoſtle aſcribes them to the Holy Spirit, is evidently this, to ſhew that whatſoever is ſpoken in Scripture, was recorded by the inſpiration of the Holy Spirit, and ſo ſpoken by him, according to the expreſs determination of St. Peter, 2 Pet. i. 21. *Holy men of God ſpake as they were moved by the Holy Ghoſt.*

The paſſages in the 2d and 3d chapters of Revelation, which I produced as an illuſtration of the

the prophet's and apoſtle's words, "confirm, according to your account, the unity of Chriſt and the Holy Spirit, and altogether further corroborate the unity of both with God. For the words of Chriſt are here as expreſsly ſaid to be the words of the Holy Spirit, as the words of the Lord Jehovah in the prophet, are ſaid to be the words of the Holy Spirit by St. Paul." p. 122, 123.

Anſ. But to make the caſe quite parallel in every reſpect, it ſhould be obſerved, that as the prophet's and apoſtle's words are produced to prove, that the Holy Spirit is Lord or God, ſo here it ſhould be inferred, that the Spirit is Chriſt, which is palpably abſurd, and ſhould oblige you to aſſent to a more rational interpretation. The true reaſon why the words of Chriſt are aſcribed to the Spirit, is becauſe Chriſt had a commiſſion from God to deliver this revelation by an angel (whom I ſuppoſe to be the Spirit) to St. John; and conſequently, according to the uſual ſtile of Scripture, what the Spirit or Angel ſpeaks, may be properly ſaid to be ſpoke by Chriſt, as the Spirit derived his authority from him, and ſpake in his name.

2 Cor. iii. 17, 18.

In the Appeal I argued from the main ſcope and deſign of the apoſtle in this chapter, that the Lord ſignifies Chriſt; and it is obſervable in your anſwer, that though you have taken a great deal of pains to ſhew that the Lord ſignifies the Holy Ghoſt, yet you have not given any direct anſwer to the reaſons upon which my ſenſe is founded, which I verily believe are ſolid and ſatisfactory. It might be ſufficient to refer our common readers to your explication and mine, that they may be compared together. But I will make ſome ob-

ſervations upon your laboured explication, which will plainly ſhew that you have not given the true ſenſe of the apoſtle.

From the 13th verſe relating to Moſes, you argue "that the Lord Jehovah was the perſon whom he went in to confer with, Exod. xxxiv. 33, 34. and it being as plain that the apoſtle referreth to the ſame paſſage, by his expreſſing the veil taken off their hearts in the ſame words, by which Moſes expreſſes the ſame with regard to himſelf; it evidently follows that the Lord, to whom in the 16th verſe the apoſtle declares the heart of the converted ſhall be turned, is intended to mean the ſame Lord with him, before whom, when Moſes went in, he took off the veil, until he came out. But it being further plainly to be collected from the apoſtle's words that he acknowledges the Lord Jehovah to be, not only the author and diſpenſer through Moſes of the types and ſhadows in the law, but alſo the immediate enlightener of Moſes himſelf; leſt the ſpecial privilege granted to Moſes (inaſmuch as it was the Lord Jehovah himſelf from whom he received that high favour) ſhould ſeem ſuperior to that now granted to the apoſtles, to whom the Spirit meerly is implied to diſpenſe the latter; the apoſtle, to ſhew that the one and ſame favour was granted to both, declares that the Lord is that Spirit; that is, that the ſame Lord, who ſo highly favoured Moſes, is one and the ſame with that Spirit, who now enlightens the apoſtles." p. 124, 125.

Anſ. That the word *Lord* in the 17th verſe neceſſarily ſignifies Chriſt, appears very evident from the context: for in the 14th verſe the apoſtle had ſaid, that the veil of ignorance which is upon the heart of the unbelieving Jews when the Old Teſta-

ment

ment is read, is done away in Chriſt, that is, their ignorance is removed, when by embracing the Goſpel they are rightly inſtructed in the types and ſhadows of the old law. In the 16th verſe the ſame ſentiment is again ſet forth in the ſame form of expreſſion; when it (namely, the heart of the people of the Jews) ſhall turn to the Lord, the veil ſhall be taken away. To turn to the Lord, in order to have the veil taken away, can poſſibly mean nothing elſe but to believe in Chriſt, in or through whom he had juſt declared, the veil is done away. And therefore when the apoſtle goes on, ver. 17. *Now the Lord is that Spirit*, nothing can be more manifeſt, than that the word, *Lord*, muſt mean the very ſame Lord, who is mentioned in the 16th verſe, and who (the very ſame perſon) is expreſsly called Chriſt, ver. 14. It is very ſtrange, that you ſhould in earneſt contend that the Lord, to whom the apoſtle in the 16th verſe declares the heart of the Jews ſhall be turned, is the ſame Lord Jehovah with whom, or whoſe angel repreſenting God, Moſes held a conference. The heart of the Jews could not with any propriety be ſaid to be converted to the Lord Jehovah, for him they already believed in and acknowledged; their grand failure was not acknowledging Jeſus as the Meſſiah, which undeniably ſhews that the Lord in the 16th verſe means Chriſt, and not the Lord Almighty, and conſequently the word *Lord* in the 17th ver. neceſſarily denotes the ſame perſon.

Again, when you contend that the miniſtration of the Spirit would be inferior to the Moſaic diſpenſation, upon ſuppoſition that the Spirit be any thing leſs than God, becauſe God is plainly allowed to be the immediate author of the Moſaic

diſpenſation, and the Spirit is ſet forth as the author of the Goſpel; you in this way of arguing make a compariſon without the leaſt colour of evidence to ſupport it. In this very chapter God is plainly repreſented as the author of the chriſtian diſpenſation, ver. 6. as it is intimated that he was the author of the Jewiſh, ver. 13. and therefore God is conſidered as the author of both diſpenſations, who employed Moſes as the immediate miniſter of the one, and Chriſt of the other; and conſequently, the foundation of your argument is demoliſhed. The whole purport of St. Paul's diſcourſe is to point out the excellency of the Goſpel diſpenſation above that of the Jewiſh: that the former ſhews us the way to eternal life, but the latter could end only in men's condemnation; that the law of Moſes was wrapped up in types and ſhadows, and was only temporary; whereas the Goſpel is plainly and clearly ſet forth, and is to continue for ever. You endeavour to evade the groſs abſurdity of ſuppoſing the Lord and the Spirit of the Lord to ſignify the Holy Ghoſt, that is, the Spirit of the Spirit, by obſerving, "that the Lord Jehovah and his Spirit are one and the ſame being, and that the apoſtle calls him the Spirit of the Lord, though he be Lord himſelf, in as true and proper a ſenſe, as the ſpirit of a man is the man himſelf." *Anſ.* That the Lord Jehovah and his Spirit are not one and the ſame being, has been abundantly proved in this treatiſe: and the abſurdity of making the Spirit as an eſſential part of God, as the ſpirit of a man is of a man, has been already taken notice of; which indeed is little elſe but the old ſabellian notion of conſidering the three perſons as three different modes of the ſame being. Add to this, that the word,

word, *Lord*, in this conſtruction always ſignifies Chriſt, and that the title of Lord is never applied to the Holy Spirit in the Old or New Teſtament.

As to your paraphraſe of the 18th verſe there is very little in it according to your own account to confirm your groundleſs notion of a compariſon between Moſes and the apoſtles with reſpect to God and the Spirit, which has been already obviated. The true meaning of the 18th verſe is this: *But we all with open face*, this is not ſaid in oppoſition to what went before, but rather by way of explication of, or inference from, the words immediately foregoing: *where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty*; and therefore we all, all true chriſtians, do *with open face*, not through an obſcure veil, as do the Jews, as mirrours *reflecting the glory of the Lord, are changed into his* very *image* by the practice of virtue and holineſs from one degree of glory to another, which great deſign is accompliſhed by the Spirit of the Lord. The words in the original, as you rightly take notice, are ambiguous, either *the Lord the Spirit*, namely, Chriſt, who in the foregoing verſe is affirmed to be the Spirit the apoſtle was ſpeaking of, or elſe *by the Spirit of the Lord.* What follows, entirely depends upon your imaginary compariſon between God and the Spirit of God, which I have already diſproved, and therefore what is built upon it, muſt fall to the ground.

Having thus examined every material article relating to God, Chriſt, and the Holy Spirit; I come now to conſider what you have offered with regard to thoſe paſſages of Scripture where the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are mentioned together.

I obſerved in the Appeal with reſpect to the original inſtitution of baptiſm, that our Saviour's own words going before, entirely deſtroy the concluſion uſually drawn from this remarkable declaration. *All power is given to me in heaven and in earth*; and conſequently, the Father is mentioned as the original giver of that power, the Son as the perſon to whom the power was given, and the Holy Ghoſt as the perſon whom our Lord chiefly employs in the exerciſe of this power, according to the commiſſion he *received* from his God and Father.

In anſwer to this plain argument, you obſerve "that the Son is ſet forth in Scripture as the only begotten of the Father, perſonally ſubſiſting with the Father from the beginning; the joint Creator of all things, himſelf uncreated; eternal, and one with the Father, partaking of the ſame nature; and therefore one God with the Father. Now theſe words of our Saviour, or any other, which ſeem, when taken in their literal ſenſe, to claſh with this general doctrine, muſt neceſſarily, if they are capable of any other ſenſe, be underſtood in that which ſhall exactly correſpond with the conſtant tenor of the whole Scriptures. But theſe words, when underſtood to be ſpoken by Chriſt concerning his human nature, do no way contradict what the Scriptures ſet forth concerning his divine nature. But if underſtood of the perſon of the Son of God abſolutely, they then plainly oppoſe the other undeniable doctrines, and conſequently, muſt be taken in the ſame ſenſe moſt agreeable thereto. The meaning then of theſe words of our Saviour is evidently this: my Father in conſideration of what the human nature by me aſſumed, and thereby made my own proper nature as much as my divine,

divine, hath ſuffered here; grants to this my human nature, as a reward of its ſufferings to partake in union with my divine nature all that power which I as God enjoyed before my humiliation in right of the latter: which ſenſe being admitted, as it evidently muſt, to reconcile theſe words to other parts of Scripture, our inference remains ſtill firm and unſhaken." p. 127, 128.

Anſ. It is certainly a very good rule in the interpretation of Scripture to explain ſome particular paſſages with the general tenor of the whole Scripture. But this rule rightly applied, will effectually demoliſh the notion you contend for. There are in the New Teſtament two hundred and forty paſſages * which repreſent Chriſt as a perſon inferior to Almighty God. The expreſſions relating to this point, are plain and clear, incapable of any other ſenſe without violence and diſtortion: there is not one paſſage, when rightly explained, which in ſenſe ſets forth Chriſt's equality with the Father; his ſuppoſed equality is no more than a conſequential doctrine, deduced from ſome few texts, eaſily capable of another ſenſe conſiſtent with the general tenor of Scripture. Particularly, with regard to the inſtances you produce, I have explained above the true Scripture notion of the Son of God: I have likewiſe ſhewn that he is never ſtiled the Creator or joint Creator of all things; the form of the expreſſions, in which Chriſt's part in the creation is ſet forth, neceſſarily denotes him an inferior inſtrument.

As to his being deemed uncreated, it is expreſſly contradicted by ſome few deciſive texts. With

* See Dr. Clarke's Scripture Doctrine, ſect 5. ch. 2.

reſpect to the notion of his partaking of the ſame nature, and being one with the Father, I have ſhewn, that Scripture ſays nothing of this ſubtle diſtinction, but is a conſequential doctrine deduced from expreſſions not only capable of, but likewiſe requiring another ſenſe. As to the doctrine of a divine and human nature, of which Chriſt is ſuppoſed to be compounded, I have ſhewn that it is a meer invention of the learned to ſolve palpable abſurdities. You are obliged to confeſs that your cauſe is gone, unleſs the divine and human nature be admitted: all power, ſays our Saviour, is given unto *me*; if *me* ſignifies our Saviour's whole perſon, his inferiority to the Father is undeniably eſtabliſhed by your own confeſſion extorted from you by the glaring evidence of truth. But is it poſſible to believe, that any common chriſtian ſhould take our Saviour's words in ſuch a ſenſe, as if *me* did not ſignify his whole perſon, but his human nature as diſtinguiſhed from his divine? could the apoſtles entertain any ſuch notion, to whom the words were addreſſed? It is an undoubted matter of fact, that no chriſtian writer ever advanced ſuch an interpretation till ſeveral hundred years after the days of the apoſtles, when the learned inventors of the Athanaſian doctrine were driven to this famous diſtinction, in order to palliate the groſs abſurdity of their invented ſcheme; and the learned defenders of the Athanaſian doctrine are obliged to ſupport the ſame diſtinction; otherwiſe, their cauſe is gone for ever.

Let your paraphraſe of our Saviour's words be examined by common ſenſe: *all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth*, that is, my Father has granted to me conſidered in my human nature, what

what I had full power, as being equally God with him, to have granted to myſelf; ſo that, though I acknowledge the Father as the giver, yet I am under no obligation upon account of receiving the power I am poſſeſſed of; for as God, I rightfully enjoyed the ſame power with my Father before my humiliation. Whether we conſider the character of the ſpeaker, or the hearers, it is impoſſible to fix ſuch an abſurd ſenſe upon this declaration. Common ſenſe can aſſure us, that our Saviour, who had power given him by the Father upon account of his humiliation, was obliged to the Father for the poſſeſſion of this power, and that he never enjoyed the ſame before his humiliation: that a perſon, who has power given him by another, is in that reſpect inferior to him from whom he received it. Before I diſmiſs this article, I would juſt obſerve, that, when our Lord ſpeaks of all power being given to him, the meaning is not, that he had the ſame power in the ſame univerſal ſenſe, as if he became equally omnipotent with the Father; but *all power* muſt be interpreted conſiſtently with the following words to which it is reſtrained; *go ye therefore and teach all nations*, &c. that is, I have received from the Father ſufficient power to carry on the important work of man's redemption.

You go on to obſerve, "that I have utterly miſtaken the true foundation of this inference, namely, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are equally entitled to the Godhead, becauſe we are commanded to be baptized into the name of each perſon. For it is not merely upon this account, that it is inferred that theſe three perſons are equally divine; but becauſe we are thereby taught firmly to believe, that their joint and equal con-

concurrence is abſolutely neceſſary to the procurement of thoſe benefits thereby vouchſafed to us. The apoſtles were firſt to teach mankind to believe in the Son and the Holy Spirit as well as the Father: to believe that ſalvation was only to be obtained from the Father, through the mediation of Chriſt his Son, by the neceſſary guidance and illumination of the Holy Spirit; and conſequently, to baptize them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt. But if theſe two perſons, Son and Holy Spirit, are not eternal and coequal with the Father; we then are taught to believe contrary to all ſenſe and reaſon, that God Almighty hath laid himſelf under ſuch reſtrictions, as not to be able to confer his graces without the concurrence of two inferior creatures, and hath as it were actually advanced two creatures to a formal coequality with himſelf." p. 129, 130.

Anſ. It is true, we are required to believe in Chriſt and the Holy Spirit as well as the Father; neither, as Chriſtians, can we expect ſalvation but through the mediation of the Son, and the aſſiſtance of the Holy Spirit: upon which account we are commanded to be baptized into the name of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, as well as of the Father. What follows from hence? you infer that, if the Son and Holy Spirit are not eternal and coequal with the Father, he hath laid himſelf under obligation to two inferior beings. This inference is not warranted either by reaſon or ſcripture, which plainly aſſure us, that the Almighty Creator thinks fit to employ inferior agents in the government of the world. To argue that God could not have diſpenſed his grace and favour, without the concurrence of the Son and Holy

ly

ly Spirit, merely becauſe he hath actually made them inſtrumental to our ſalvation, is preſuming a point not only without premiſes, but in oppoſition to the plain declarations of Scripture, which has undeniably determined, that the whole ſcheme of our ſalvation originally proceeded from, and was entirely owing to, the free grace and favour of the one ſupreme God; and we are expreſsly aſſured, that the Son and Holy Spirit were ſent, given, and appointed by him, and act in all things according to his will and pleaſure. Does not this neceſſarily imply, that the ſupreme Father might have employed any other inferior agents in the important buſineſs of our ſalvation, if it had been agreeable to his infinite wiſdom? Has not God employed angels as miniſtring ſpirits for the benefit of the church? can it be inferred from hence, that God hath ſo tied himſelf up as not to be able to beſtow his favours without the concurrence of inferior beings? The whole ſcheme of providence both in the natural and moral world, is carried on by ſubordinate agents. From whence a late excellent writer * has beautifully illuſtrated the mediatorial plan, and has undeniably ſhewn it is agreeable to the ordinary courſe of God's diſpenſations. Neither hath God actually advanced two creatures to a formal coequality with himſelf, by joining the Son and Holy Spirit to himſelf in the office of baptiſm. The words going before, as I have already proved, demonſtrate the contrary; all power *is given* to me. The plain reaſon why chriſtians muſt be initiated into the name of the Son and Holy Spirit, clearly appears from the whole ſcheme of the Goſpel diſpenſation, be-

* Biſhop Butler.

cauſe

cauſe God hath appointed them as chief inſtruments for the ſalvation of men. Neither doth it follow that, becauſe it is ſaid, not into the names, but into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, therefore their power and authority are one and the ſame; ſince this way of arguing would equally prove, that the Father, the Son, and the holy angels have but one and the ſame glory, becauſe it is ſaid, Luke ix. 26. *Whoſoever ſhall be aſhamed of me and my words, of him, ſhall the Son of man be aſhamed, when he ſhall come in his own glory, and in his Father's, and of the holy angels.*

I produced in the Appeal (2d edit. p. 71.) 1 Cor. x. 2. to ſhew that the argument uſually drawn from baptiſm to prove a coequal Trinity, is entirely without foundation.

Upon this you obſerve "that though the apoſtle ſays, the Iſraelites were baptized into Moſes; yet it is clear that he means nothing more than their paſſing through the Red Sea under the conduct of Moſes, which, according to the apoſtle, was a type of the chriſtian baptiſm; not that he underſtood it to be as full and as perfect an inſtitution, as the chriſtian baptiſm, the original account of it implying no ſuch thing." p. 130.

Anſ. In whatever ſenſe the apoſtle's words be taken, it is not probable that he would have mentioned the Iſraelites as being baptized into Moſes, if being baptized into any perſon, had implied that perſon to be of equal dignity with God; from whence it follows that baptiſm is very far from ſignifying the reverence and worſhip due to Almighty God. The apoſtle very properly mentions this act of the Iſraelites of being baptized into Moſes to ſhew, that it would be of no advantage

vantage to chriſtians, though they were in like manner baptized into Chriſt, and thereby acknowledged him for their Lord and Maſter; unleſs they were careful to avoid ſin and wickedneſs, and lead a life agreeable to the precepts of chriſtianity: ſo that the apoſtle's argument neceſſarily ſuppoſes a compariſon between the Iſraelites and chriſtians. As the former became diſciples of Moſes by being baptized unto him in the cloud and in the ſea; ſo the latter became diſciples of Chriſt by the baptiſm of water: as the Iſraelites believed Moſes as well as the Lord, Exod. xiv. 31. ſo likewiſe chriſtians were required to believe in Chriſt, as well as God. Neither is it of any importance, that the Iſraelites are not ſaid to be baptized into the name of Moſes; for being baptized into Moſes is exactly of the ſame import, ſince chriſtians are ſaid to have been baptized into Chriſt, Gal. iii. 27. Rom. vi. 3. What you obſerve with reſpect to the Jewiſh baptiſm not being ſo full and perfect an inſtitution as the chriſtian baptiſm, does not take off from the propriety of arguing from the one to the other: neither is the force of the argument deſtroyed by the ſuppoſition of the Jewiſh baptiſm being conſidered as the type of the chriſtian; an act of ſolemn adoration, which you ſuppoſe to be the true import of the chriſtian baptiſm, cannot be properly typified by an act which implies no ſuch thing, as the Jewiſh baptiſm confeſſedly did not. Upon the whole as the Iſraelites being baptized into Moſes, does not prove Moſes to be ſupreme God; ſo chriſtians being baptized into Chriſt, does not prove Chriſt to be ſupreme God, but only a teacher ſent from God, whoſe doctrine all chriſtians are obliged to obey; juſt as the Iſraelites profeſſed their obligations

tions to obey the law of Moſes, whom they acknowledged to be a teacher ſent from God.

As to 1 Cor. i. 15. let the whole context be conſidered, and it will plainly appear, that St. Paul could have no other meaning than that the true import of being baptized into any one's name, was to profeſs himſelf a diſciple of that perſon as a teacher or maſter, in whoſe name he was baptized. The deſign of St. Paul in this chapter, was to reprove the Corinthians upon account of parties they had formed in their church by ſetting up diſtinct teachers or maſters. Verſe 12. *Now this I ſay, that every one of you ſaith, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Chriſt*; that is, you rank yourſelves under different leaders, or maſters. Verſe 13. *Is Chriſt divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were you baptized into the name of Paul?* that is, is Chriſt our only Head divided into more heads than one? am I Paul your maſter? do you profeſs a religion of mine? have I taught you any doctrine of my own? Could St. Paul poſſibly mean, did I ever ſet up myſelf for God? or could the Corinthians entertain any ſuch notion? The earneſtneſs of St. Paul's queſtion, verſe 13. did not ariſe from the ſuppoſition that baptizing into his own name was in other terms ſetting up himſelf for a God, as you imagine, but from his zeal to reprove the uncharitable diviſions of the Corinthians; for which purpoſe he very earneſtly urges a pertinent argument, that Chriſt was their only Maſter, neither had they ever acknowledged any other by virtue of chriſtianity; and therefore it was an unchriſtian practice to form themſelves into parties, and to rank themſelves under different maſters.

With

With reſpect to your obſervation, that the orthodox chriſtians actually accuſed Simon Magus of ſetting himſelf up for a God upon his arrogating to himſelf the character of Chriſt, and ſo baptizing into his own name, it does not appear by any thing ſaid of this impoſter in the acts of the apoſtles, that he baptized people into his own name, and upon that account was eſteemed as a God. Irenæus, an early writer of the church, has given an account of Simon Magus: from him we learn that he was the author and founder of ſeveral pernicious hereſies; that he was glorified as a God: but he has delivered nothing about baptizing people into his own name, and being acknowledged as a God upon that account; which alone would ſuit your purpoſe in producing this inſtance to diſprove the ſenſe I have given of the apoſtle's words, which evidently appears from this chapter, namely, that being baptized into the name of any one, is to enter himſelf a diſciple of him into whoſe name he is baptized. Thus they who were baptized into Moſes, were the diſciples of Moſes; they who were baptized into John's baptiſm, were John's diſciples, and conſequently, to be baptized into the name of Jeſus, is to profeſs ourſelves his diſciples.

You go on to obſerve that "it is not merely from the Son and Holy Spirit being joined in the office of baptiſm, that we argue them equal to the Father, but from its being declared alſo that their joint and equal concurrence is abſolutely neceſſary to the procurement of thoſe benefits thereby vouchſafed to us; and no ſuch thing being declared of the elect angels, 1 Tim. v. 21. St. Paul's joining them to the Father and Son in his charge to Timothy, doth by no means argue them, in the

the ſame manner, equal to Father and Son; and conſequently, the parallel not holding in all its parts, the argument drawn from thence, is of no force." p. 131.

Anſ. I have proved above that the concurrence of the Son and Holy Spirit in the work of our ſalvation, entirely depends upon the ſupreme authority of the one God and Father of all, who thought fit to employ them as inferior agents in this important buſineſs; and conſequently, their joint concurrence cannot be thought neceſſary in that ſenſe, as if the Almighty could not have made uſe of other inſtruments, if it had been agreeable to his infinite wiſdom. It is expreſsly declared in Scripture, that God employs angels as miniſters of his church, and more particularly the ſeven elect angels, who ſeem in this paſſage to be denoted, who are the ſame with the ſeven ſpirits before the throne, from whom John wiſhes grace and peace, as well as the Father and the Son, Revel. i. 7. As therefore they are employed by God as well as the Son and Holy Spirit, though doubtleſs in lower offices, and are likewiſe joined with God and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, in a ſolemn charge delivered to Timothy, the parallel exactly holds, and the argument drawn from it, is concluſive. The Son and Holy Spirit can no more be proved to be equal to the Father, becauſe they are joined to him in the office of baptiſm, than it can be proved that the elect angels are equal to the Father and the Son, becauſe they are joined to the Father and Son, in a ſolemn charge delivered to Timothy.

You want to get rid of this ſtriking example by giving a new interpretation to the apoſtle's words, namely, that the elect angels do not ſig-

nify what we commonly mean by angels, but rulers and paſtors of the church. Your interpretation is founded upon Malach. ii. 7. where a prieſt is ſtiled a meſſenger of the Lord of Hoſts; and upon the 2d and 3d chapters of Revelation, where every particular paſtor of each of the ſeven churches is ſtiled an angel. But this is of no weight to prove, that elect angels muſt ſignify rulers and paſtors of the church, in which ſenſe it is never uſed in Scripture: on the contrary, the elect angels certainly denote the ſame with the ſeven ſpirits before the throne of God, Revel. i. 4. and are ſtiled the ſeven holy angels——which go in and out before the glory of the Holy One. Tobit xii. 15. St. Paul very properly delivers a ſolemn charge as in the preſence of the elect angels, becauſe we are taught by Scripture, that God and Chriſt employ them as miniſters in beſtowing good things upon the faithful, and in averting miſchiefs from them.

I produced Exod. xiv. 31. 1 Chron. xxix. 20. as plain inſtances to ſhew that God and the creature are ſometimes joined together as objects of the ſame act. Upon this you obſerve, "that this is owing to the conciſeneſs of the Hebrew language, the ſame word being often uſed to expreſs different particular ſorts of the ſame general act; which therefore are only to be diſcovered by the different natures of the objects, to which the act is applied. Accordingly, when the people are ſaid, in the firſt inſtance, to believe the Lord and his ſervant Moſes; the ſort of belief given to the Lord is by ſo much higher than, and diſtinct from, that given to Moſes, as by how much the Lord is ſuperior to, and of a diſtinct nature from, Moſes. In the ſame manner and upon the ſame ac-

count in the ſecond inſtance, the worſhip by which the congregation worſhipped the Lord, is underſtood to be proportionably ſuperior to, and diſtinct from that by which they worſhipped the King." p. 132.

Anſ. It muſt be admitted that the Hebrew language is ſhort and ſcanty: but it is not peculiar to this language for the ſame word to be uſed in different ſenſes, according to the nature of the object to which it is applied: the very ſame thing may be ſaid of all the languages I am acquainted with. Thus the word, everlaſting, in our language as well as the Hebrew, is applied to God and the hills: but when applied to God, it ſignifies eternity in the higheſt and ſtricteſt ſenſe; and the ſame word, when joined to hills, ſignifies only a laſting duration; ſo that this word derives its ſenſe from the nature of the ſubject, to which it is applied. You have not aſſigned the true reaſon of the act of worſhip paid to the Lord and the King, 1 Chron. xxix. 20. being expreſſed by the ſame word, namely, the ſmall number of words in the Hebrew language: for remarkable it is, that there are at leaſt four words in this ſcanty language, whereby the act of worſhipping is denoted. "The ſort of belief, as you rightly obſerve, given to the Lord, in the firſt inſtance, is by ſo much higher than, and diſtinct from, that given to Moſes, as by how much the Lord is ſuperior to, and of a diſtinct nature from, Moſes." Give me leave to apply the ſame obſervation to God and Chriſt, when we are required to believe in Chriſt as well as God, the caſe being exactly parallel. So likewiſe with regard to the office of baptiſm, by which we are initiated into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt,

Ghoſt, this ſolemn act muſt neceſſarily be interpreted in a higher ſenſe when applied to the Father, who in other plain texts is determined to be the one ſupreme God, than when applied to the Son and Holy Spirit, who are expreſsly ſaid to be ſent and given by the Father. So likewiſe, as you rightly obſerve, in the ſecond inſtance, the worſhip by which the Congregation worſhipped the Lord, is underſtood to be proportionably ſuperior to, and diſtinct from, that by which they worſhipped the King. Let the ſame obſervation be applied to the worſhip paid to almighty God, and to Chriſt; and it will furniſh you with a clear ſolution of all difficulties, upon the article of worſhip, with which you have been perplexed, and which ſhall be diſtinctly conſidered in its proper place.

With reſpect to thoſe many plain texts, which I have produced, as repreſenting Chriſt and the Holy Spirit, utterly diſtinct from God; [See Appeal, 2d edit. p. 72, 73, 74.] your anſwer fairly owns the fact; only you have recourſe to your old diſtinction, that God in theſe texts means the Father; it is impoſſible indeed it ſhould have any other ſenſe: but what you would have your readers infer is this, that God, when uſed ſingly and alone, be underſtood to comprehend Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, of which you cannot produce one example, as I have frequently obſerved. However, the light of truth ſhines ſo ſtrongly before your eyes, that you are obliged to grant, that "the Father is peculiarly called God, as well upon the account of his being the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, as upon that of his being the ſource, or fountain, from whence the divinity of the other two perſons eternally flows." Page 132.

Let the word *eternally* be left out, for which you have no Scripture, and I have no objection to this account of the ſupreme Father. You have in effect given up the whole cauſe you are labouring to ſupport. If the Father be God in a peculiar manner, as being the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; if the Father be the perſon, from whom the divinity of the Son and Holy Spirit is derived, it neceſſarily follows, that the Father is the one ſupreme God; he only is ſelf-exiſtent, and conſequently, the Son and Holy Spirit have not the ſame eſſential perfections with the Father; they cannot be divine in as high a ſenſe as the Father, becauſe they want the moſt eſſential perfection of the one ſupreme God, which is ſelf-exiſtence. I beg leave to call this a demonſtrative argument againſt the Athanaſian Trinity, formed upon your own conceſſion, extorted from you by the force of truth.

I earneſtly recommended to my Chriſtian readers, this collection of texts, wherein Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are mentioned together: from whence it appears beyond the poſſibility of a contradiction, that God does not ſignify Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, but the Father only, expreſsly diſtinguiſhed from the Son and Holy Spirit.

In repreſenting this argument, you make me ſay, that "the term, God, never ſignifies either the three Perſons taken together, or any one of the other two taken ſeparately, or apart." Pages 145, 146.

With reſpect to the Holy Spirit, I have proved above, that he is never ſtiled directly God. But I never denied that the title of God is ſometimes given to Chriſt, as having fairly produced examples of it.

You

You profeſs to have ſhewn in "the courſe of this examination, that the Son is frequently ſtiled God, and that in as high and as abſolute a ſenſe as the Father, contrary to my groundleſs inſinuation of the term being taken abſolutely, when applied only to the Father, and in an inferior ſenſe, when applied to the Son." Page 146.

Anſ. On the other hand, I have plainly proved that the term, God, when taken abſolutely, always means the Perſon of the Father; and that the term, God, when applied to the Son, is undeniably uſed in the inferior ſenſe; neither is he frequently ſo ſtiled, the undoubted inſtances of it are but few.

You obſerve, "that the inferiority in Scripture aſcribed to the Son, regards only either his human nature, or the relation of Sonſhip, or office; while his unity and equality with the Father, as the only begotten Son of God, and conſequently, of the ſame nature with the Father, and therefore God the Son, is conſtantly preſerved, and frequently inculcated." Page 146.

Anſ. I have effectually overthrown the diſtinction of the human and divine nature, by which you endeavour to evade the inferiority aſcribed to Chriſt, which you cannot deny: I have likewiſe demoliſhed the notion of Chriſt's equality with the Father, drawn from the relation of a Son.

And whereas you affirm, that "the Holy Spirit is called God in the ſame ſenſe with the Father." The falſhood of this undeniably appears from hence, that he is ſo far from being called God in as high a ſenſe as the Father, that he is never ſtiled God at all, as I have proved above by a particular examination of thoſe paſſages, that have been uſually alledged for this purpoſe.

Your arguing from the Holy Spirit, being deſcribed as the Spirit of God, to prove that he is as much in God as the ſpirit of man is in man, has been conſidered above, which indeed deſtroys the diſtinct perſonality of the Holy Spirit, and makes him the ſame with God. When you obſerve, that the ſeeming inferiority aſcribed to the Holy Spirit in Scripture, plainly regards his office only; I anſwer, the Scripture has clearly determined, that the Holy Spirit is a perſon inferior to God and Chriſt, becauſe he is repreſented as being given, ſent, and employed by them for the benefit of the church. But as to metaphyſical nature, or eſſence, in which you would inſinuate his equality with the Father conſiſts, the Scripture has determined nothing; this was the invention of men, who aimed at being wiſe above what was written.

Again, I have confuted above the notion you advance, with reſpect to Chriſt and the Holy Spirit, being ſuppoſed conſtant and neceſſarily concurring agents with the Father, in the works of creation and redemption; the Scripture has plainly determined their inferior agency, by aſcribing their miniſterial offices to the ſupreme authority of the one God and Father of all, who thought fit to employ them.

Laſtly, when you affirm "that the ſame attributes, titles, and characters, which are conſtantly aſcribed to God, when mentioned ſingly, are frequently, and in as full a ſenſe, given diſtinctly to the Son and Holy Spirit:" you are confronted with plain Scripture, which has given ſome peculiar titles and attributes to the Father, which are never applied to the Son and Holy Spirit: [See Appeal 2d edit. p. 13; and what has been above alledged in this Defence.] and with reſpect to thoſe titles

titles and attributes, which are confeſſedly aſcribed to the Son and Holy Spirit, they muſt be underſtood in an inferior ſenſe, as I have already proved.

Having demonſtrated the falſhood of your premiſes, your concluſion naturally fails, which is this: "Whence it evidently follows, (that is, the truth of the preceding obſervations being eſtabliſhed, which I have effectually overthrown) that the term, God, when uſed in Scripture, without any particular ſpecification, cannot be denied to be applicable to the three Perſons altogether: and therefore, a manifeſt fallacy runs through the whole argument advanced in the Appeal, the proofs it is built upon, being plainly reſtrained, and particular, while the concluſion is, notwithſtanding, unlimitted and univerſal." Page 147.

Anſ. The nature of my argument is this: there are ſeveral hundred paſſages in the New Teſtament, where the word, God, by virtue of the conſtruction, is neceſſarily confined to the Father only, which you are obliged to grant. Again, in all the paſſages, where the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are mentioned together, God and the Father are uſed indifferently, to denote the ſame Perſon, as diſtinguiſhed from the Son and Holy Spirit, which likewiſe you are obliged to grant: from whence I juſtly conclude, that the word, God, taken abſolutely, does not ſignify Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, but the Father only, there being no paſſage where it neceſſarily conveys the notion of three Perſons. Add to this, that the word, God, in Scripture never ſignifies more perſons than one, either the Father, or the Son, to whom it is ſometimes given in the inferior ſenſe.

You charge me with an unfair manner of comparing the doctrine of the Athanaſian Creed, with the doctrine of the Scriptures. You obſerve, that the diſtinction and unity of the divine perſons may be thus underſtood; "The Scriptures declare that God is one, and at the ſame time aſcribe to each perſon, the characters, powers, and attributes of the one God." Page 147.

Anſ. The misfortune is, that the Scriptures conſtantly declare the direct contrary to be true; which have determined, in the moſt ſolemn manner, not only that God is one, in which all Chriſtians are agreed, but likewiſe, that this one God is the Father only, expreſsly diſtinguiſhed from the Son, and Holy Spirit. When therefore you affirm, that "the Scriptures ſay neither more nor leſs than the Athanaſian Creed;" you are directly anſwered, by comparing the Scripture declarations, with the declarations of the Athanaſian Creed: according to the former, the one God is the Father only; but according to the latter, the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghoſt is God; and yet there are not three Gods, but one God. It is impoſſible to reconcile theſe declarations with Scripture, or with each other; and therefore, as a ſincere Chriſtian, I chuſe rather to give up the Athanaſian Creed, than the declarations of Chriſt and his Apoſtles. But I cannot ſee how I have been unfair in making the compariſon: I thought myſelf obliged, as a Chriſtian, to compare together the words of God and the words of men: if doctrines eſtabliſhed by the authority of man, will not bear the teſt of Scripture interpreted by common ſenſe, who can help it? I am afraid, the only unfairneſs of which you complain, is the method I have taken, which indeed has a natural tendency

tendency to demonſtrate, even to eye-ſight, the falſhood of human decrees; which muſt appear very diſagreeable to thoſe perſons, who ſeem determined to ſupport right, or wrong, the outward profeſſion of favourite opinions. I am well aſſured, that no unprejudiced Chriſtian can poſſibly condemn me, for the truly Chriſtian method taken in the Appeal.

You obſerve, "that the title of God being eminently given to the Perſon of the Father in ſome texts, where the three Perſons are diſtinctly mentioned, is plainly allowed and implied in the Athanaſian Creed; where the eminence of the Perſon of the Father over the other two, as being the fountain and ſource of their divinity, is clearly ſtated in the 21ſt, 22d, and 23d propoſitions; and though, in the 24th and 26th, their co-eternity and co-equality are, from the unity of their nature, juſtly affirmed; yet a priority of rank and order, is clearly all along reſerved to the Perſon of the Father." Page 147.

Anſ. It is true, the eminence of the Father is clearly ſet forth in ſome of the propoſitions of this famous Creed; but then in others it is no leſs plainly and expreſsly contradicted. If the Father be God in a more eminent ſenſe than the Son and Holy Spirit, it cannot be true that the three Perſons are co-eternal and co-equal, which neceſſarily ſignifies an equality in every reſpect; and the ſame thing is ſtrongly aſſerted in theſe words: *And in this Trinity none is afore, or after other; none is greater, or leſs than another.* Indeed the Creed itſelf, is full of palpable abſurdities and contradictions, abſolutely inconſiſtent with common ſenſe, and the plain declarations of Scripture.

You

You aſk, "Have not Chriſt and his Apoſtles taught, that Chriſt and his Father are one in the ſtricteſt ſenſe?"

Anſ. I have proved the contrary. Again, "have they not taught that the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit, are, in the ſame manner, one?" *Anſ.* They have aſſerted no ſuch thing in any ſenſe. "Do they not teach, that each is God, and yet that there is but one God?" *Anſ.* They teach as plainly as words can expreſs it, that the Father is the one God, diſtinguiſhed from the Son and Holy Spirit. They have given Chriſt the title of God, in an inferior ſenſe: but the Holy Spirit is never ſtiled God at all. "Is not the Son declared to be the only begotten of the Father? Doth not the Holy Spirit proceed forth from the Father? Was not the Son, from the beginning, that is, eternally with the Father? And is not the Holy Spirit called expreſsly the eternal Spirit? Heb. ix. 14. And though ſome copies read it, Holy Spirit, yet, if he was never called eternal, he muſt be acknowledged as eternal as God, whoſe Spirit he is." Page 148.

Anſ. I have plainly ſhewn from Scripture, that the Son is not ſtiled the only begotten of the Father, upon the account of deriving the ſame nature from the Father, with reſpect to eſſence, or ſubſtance, and I have diſtinctly explained the ſeveral ſenſes, in which he is ſtiled the Son of God, not one of which is conſiſtent with your ſcheme. As for the Holy Spirit's proceeding from the Father, it has no ſort of relation to eſſence, or ſubſtance, but means his going forth, or being ſent out from the Father, according to the ſtrict propriety of the Greek. Beginning, cannot poſſibly ſignify eternally, without a manifeſt perverſion of language.

And

And as to the Spirit's being inferred to be eternal, becauſe he is ſtiled the Spirit of God, this goes upon the ſuppoſition that the Spirit is an eſſential part of God; whereas the contrary manifeſtly appears from every declaration of Scripture, wherein he is mentioned.

Again, you aſk, "Can there be three eternals? Can there be three Gods?"

Anſ. There evidently cannot. In this we are both agreed. It is expreſsly contrary to reaſon, and to the ſolemn determination of Scripture, to ſuppoſe three Gods, that is, three Perſons equally ſupreme, equally ſelf-exiſtent, equally adorned with all poſſible perfections. If you ſuppoſe the Son and Holy Spirit equally ſupreme with the Father; turn it which way you will, you make three diſtinct Gods. If you ſay that the Father only is ſupreme, and allow *any* ſubordination to the Son and Holy Spirit, then your own charge falls upon you; here is "one ſupreme, and two ſubordinate: this is ſtill making three diſtinct Gods, contrary to the expreſs declarations of Scripture, which gives not the leaſt warrant for any ſuch diſtinction: and to ſuppoſe a creature, or creatures, exalted to the dignity of a God by office, is to ſuppoſe them only nominal Gods; that is, Gods and no Gods at the ſame time."

Anſ. Thus you yourſelf are involved, in the very ſame difficulties which you fix upon me. In order to avoid ſuch perplexities, you think it neceſſary to conclude, that "the three Perſons muſt be equally, however incomprehenſibly the one God: for this is, The myſtery, which was kept ſecret ſince the world began, but now is made manifeſt, and by the Scriptures of the Prophets, according to the commandment of the everlaſting God,

God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith, Rom. xvi. 25, 26." Pages 148, 149.

Anſ. It is no wonder that doctrines abſurd and ſelf-contradictory ſhould neceſſarily lead their defenders to manifeſt inconſiſtencies. Let Scripture interpreted by common ſenſe be our rule, and we avoid the abſurdity of making three ſupreme Gods on the one ſide, which is expreſsly condemned by Scripture and reaſon; and likewiſe the no leſs equal abſurdity on the other of making three ſupreme intelligent perſons one intelligent being, and at the ſame time inconſiſtently aſcribing a ſort of *ſupremacy* and preheminence to *one*, and a *ſubordination* to the other *two perſons*, which deſtroys the notion of their being *equally* the one God. On the other hand, the Scripture uniformly and ſolemnly maintains the doctrine of one ſupreme God in the ſtrict and literal ſenſe, and plainly and powerfully determines the Father to be the very perſon, as diſtinguiſhed from all other perſons or beings, and particularly Chriſt and the Holy Spirit, who are conſtantly repreſented as perſons inferior to him and acting in all things, according to his ſupreme will and pleaſure. The Son indeed is ſometimes ſtiled a God in the inferior ſenſe, which notion is warranted by the expreſs authority of our Lord himſelf; and to argue that Chriſt cannot be a God at all, unleſs he be God in as high a ſenſe as the Father, is in other terms to condemn the Scripture for giving the title of God to inferior beings, and particularly to Chriſt. But remarkable it is, that the Holy Spirit is never ſtiled God at all.

In order to prove the doctrine of three perſons and one God to be the grand end of the chriſtian revelation, you quote Rom. xvi. 25, 26. I cannot

not help reminding you as a ſincere chriſtian, to forbear ſuch a manifeſt abuſe of Scripture, and ſuch a groſs impoſition upon your chriſtian readers, as you have too plainly diſcovered in this quotation. The myſtery St. Paul refers to, undeniably means the calling of the Gentiles to the knowledge of God's will by the revelation of his Son; upon this ſubject he had profeſſedly diſcourſed in a conſiderable part of this epiſtle, and this ſenſe of the word *myſtery* is unanſwerably determined by Epheſ. i. 9. chap. iii. 3, 6, 9. Coloſſ. i. 26, 27. The calling of the Gentiles is ſtiled a myſtery, becauſe neither Jews nor Gentiles had the leaſt notion of this extraordinary favour, till it was revealed to them by the apoſtles; but upon its revelation it ceaſed to be a myſtery: this Scripture notion of the word *myſtery* overthrows that notable application of this famous ſound to abſurd doctrines of human invention. When inquiſitive Bereans have preſumed to bring doctrines deemed myſterious to the teſt of Scripture and Reaſon, the defenders of them have always endeavoured to evade a rational examination by crying out, theſe are myſteries of faith, and ſo muſt not be examined by carnal reaſon: whereas a myſtery, according to Scripture, is ſome purpoſe or decree of God not yet revealed; and conſequently, when it is revealed, it is no longer a myſtery. To ſuppoſe any particular doctrine revealed, and at the ſame time to continue myſterious, is inconſiſtent with common ſenſe, and the Scripture notion of this famous word. If the Athanaſian doctrine of the Trinity had been the myſtery which had been kept ſecret ſince the world began, and is now made manifeſt unto all nations, it is abſolutely unaccountable that St. Paul ſhould not be able by

the

the aſſiſtance of the Spirit to expreſs this doctrine as clearly and preciſely, as writers who lived four or five hundred years after his time. But let the Appeal be conſulted upon this point, (2d edit. p. 77, 78.) to which you have given no anſwer. I would juſt add, that upon ſuppoſition St. Paul had meant the Athanaſian Trinity by the myſtery which was kept ſecret ſince the world began, but is now made manifeſt, he has actually forgot the very doctrine he was labouring to inculcate; for in the next verſe, which is the concluſion of the epiſtle, he has expreſſed himſelf as if he entertained no ſuch doctrine; *To God only wiſe, be glory through Jeſus Chriſt.* I muſt beg you to aſſign ſome good reaſon, if you ſhould write again upon this ſubject, why St. Paul, if he had meant by the word *myſtery* the Athanaſian ſcheme, could not have plainly ſaid, To God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghoſt, three perſons and one God only wiſe be glory for ever; or, to Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, three Perſons and one God be glory for ever; or elſe, to Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. As certain as St. Paul was an inſpired apoſtle, ſo certain is it that theſe doxologies were impoſed upon chriſtians by the authority of man, and not of God.

In the Appeal I thought myſelf obliged to point out that very faith which is declared in Scripture to be neceſſary to make a man a chriſtian, that it might be compared with the damnatory clauſes of the Athanaſian creed. (See Appeal, 2d edit. p. 78, 79, 80, 81, 82.)

In anſwer to this have you ſhewn, that I have miſrepreſented or miſinterpreted the plain Scripture declarations relating to this important point? you have not ſo much as attempted it. If the apoſtles have clearly determined in great numbers of paſ-

ſages,

ſages, (not two or three texts only, as you would inſinuate,) what faith is neceſſary to make men chriſtians, my buſineſs was to ſet it forth, as they have delivered it, and this I have faithfully done. And if this method has a natural tendency to overthrow creeds and articles of human invention, the charge muſt fall upon the apoſtles themſelves, who were not acquainted with the nice and ſubtle diſtinctions, invented by learned men ſeveral hundred years after their time. The whole ſtrain of the four Goſpels and Acts of the apoſtles, as obſerved in the Appeal, clearly demonſtrates that the faith neceſſarily required of Jews and Gentiles was this, namely, that Jeſus was the Chriſt, or Son of God; and all thoſe, who profeſſed this faith, were acknowledged as believers.

I mentioned indeed ſome other articles neceſſarily implied in this fundamental propoſition, that Jeſus is the Chriſt, or Son of God; but have claimed no power either for myſelf, or any other perſon to abridge, or enlarge them, as it would anſwer my purpoſe according to your inſinuation: I ſay articles neceſſarily implied, for there is no end of conſequential doctrines; and accordingly, the articles I mentioned are plainly and clearly ſet forth in Scripture itſelf as the neceſſary conſequence of this fundamental article, that Jeſus is the Chriſt.

As for that unchriſtian reflexion you caſt upon me for ſpeaking of my bleſſed Redeemer in the very words of Scripture, (p. 149) I heartily forgive you, and am diſpoſed to impute it to a warm and miſguided zeal for what you eſteem the cauſe of God.

You do not pretend to ſhew that I have miſrepreſented Scripture, with reſpect to the articles neceſſarily implied, but obſerve that I ought to have

have inferred a great deal more: particularly, "that Chriſt by virtue of being the Son of God, was equal with God, and was ſtrictly and eſſentially one with his Father." *Anſ.* I have effectually diſproved this interpretation in the courſe of the debate. I would only juſt obſerve, that when you argue "from the principle of analogy, that as an human ſon is equal in nature to his human father, ſo a divine ſon is equal in nature to his divine father." I anſwer, that this inference is not rightly drawn: for among men, a ſon does not, properly ſpeaking, derive his being from the father, his father being no more than an inſtrument in the hands of God: whereas God, when he is called Father, muſt be underſtood to be a real and efficient cauſe, the very giver of life: ſo that though there be an equality between father and ſon upon earth, yet the analogy does not hold with reſpect to God and any particular being ſtiled his Son: Son of God in Scripture generally denotes a perſon, who derives his being from God immediately without an inſtrumental cauſe. Thus Adam and angels are ſtiled the ſons of God, and Chriſt is called the only begotten, as being derived from the Father in a peculiar manner, ſo as to be diſtinguiſhed from all other ſons.

Upon the whole you conclude "that there is but one God." In this grand principle we are uniformly agreed: but ſurely it is ſomething very ſtrange, that we cannot come to an agreement what is meant by one God. There muſt be ſome very conſiderable failure either in the declarations of Scripture, or in our own underſtandings: the former caſe cannot be ſuppoſed without caſting a ſevere reproach upon the word of God; and therefore the fault muſt be ſome way or other in ourſelves.

ſelves. In any other caſe, it would be thought aſtoniſhing, if men of reaſon could not agree among themſelves what they meant by one man, by one lord, by one king, or by one angel. You have no ſooner profeſſed your faith in one God, but you immediately deny that God is one, that is, one perſon, which is the only conſiſtent ſenſe of one, when applied to an intelligent being.

Let us hear the concluſion of this important queſtion according to your account: "That this one God is but one individual perſon, the word of God no where declares: and reaſon ſhewing us, that one God and one perſon, cannot, in any proper ſenſe, be reciprocal terms: it is not only unreaſonable, but the higheſt preſumption, to confine the idea or notion of the one God, to that of one individual perſon, without the expreſs warrant of Scripture for ſo doing. The Scripture idea of God comprehends more perſons than one. For as there is evidently but one true God, and conſequently, only one true idea of God, and yet this *ſame idea* applied to three ſeveral perſons; ſo it muſt evidently follow, that the one true idea of God includes theſe three perſons. But that this ſame idea of the one God is, *equally*, applied to the three perſons, appears alſo from the direct and equal application of the characters, powers, and attributes of the one God to each perſon. And though when the three perſons are mentioned diſtinctly together, the Father alone, by way of *eminence*, is ſometimes ſtiled *God*; yet the other two perſons being at other times expreſsly called God, and Father, Son, and Holy Spirit being directly ſtiled one; this diſtinction in favour of the Father, can only be accounted for by his priority of rank and order in the Godhead: while

their being equally ſtiled God, and at the ſame time the unity of God maintained, muſt neceſſarily lead unbiaſſed minds to interpret the expreſs unity of the three perſons into an unity of nature. But the application of the evidence produced in the Appeal, evidently tends to deſtroy the unity of God, by introducing, not a trinity of perſons, but a trinity of Gods: and though the appellant, by making one of them only ſupreme, and the other two ſubordinate, makes his doctrine to chime, in ſome ſort, with the meer ſound of Scripture words; yet his diſtinction manifeſtly contradicting the expreſs words of God himſelf, who hath declared that there is none other god beſides himſelf, whereby even his ſubordinate gods are abſolutely excluded; and making the unity to conſiſt in ſupremacy alone; whereas the words of Scripture plainly fix it in the divine nature; the verdict which any man of common ſenſe muſt bring in, upon a due conſideration of the whole evidence, can be no leſs, than that the appellant has not only partially repreſented the truth, by unfairly ſuppreſſing the moſt material part, but groſly corrupted what he could not avoid producing." p. 151, 152, 153.

Anſ. Bleſſed be the God of truth; all this confuſion and perplexity may be eaſily avoided by having recourſe to Scripture, which has plainly and ſolemnly determined, that God is not only one being, but likewiſe one perſon, even the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. The Father is declared, in the moſt ſolemn manner, to be the only true God, as diſtinguiſhed from Chriſt; and likewiſe the one God is expreſsly determined to be the Father, in diſtinction from Chriſt, and the Holy Spirit; ſo that the term, *one*, when applied to God

as

as well as other intelligent beings, neceſſarily denotes one individual perſon. That the one God is one perſon, is not only the profeſſed determination of Chriſt and his apoſtles, but the ſame notion is neceſſarily implied in thouſands of paſſages of the Old and New Teſtament: when God is repreſented as ſpeaking of himſelf, I cannot help judging, that the terms, *I* and *me*, neceſſarily ſignify one perſon; when God is addreſſed to, or ſpoken of, that *thou* and *thee*, *he* and *him*, neceſſarily denote one perſon; otherwiſe, the Bible is no revelation to my underſtanding. Whatever preſumption you may fix upon me for confining the idea or notion of one God to that of one individual perſon, I am reſolved by God's aſſiſtance to profeſs and propagate this grand truth, namely, one ſupreme God and Father of all.

As to your pretence that the idea of one true God is applied to three ſeveral perſons, I have proved the contrary in the courſe of this debate; and have likewiſe overthrown the foundation on which this pretence is built, namely, "the direct and equal application of the characters, powers, and attributes of the one God to each perſon." I have likewiſe ſhewn the manifeſt inconſiſtency of making the perſon of the Father God in a more eminent ſenſe than the Son and Holy Spirit, and at the ſame time their being co-equal and co-eternal. With reſpect to the unity of nature, in which you ſuppoſe the unity of God to conſiſt, I have ſhewn above, that the Scripture has determined nothing about unity of nature or eſſence. Your notion indeed deſtroys the real unity of God, for which you ſeem ſolicitous: for three co-equal perſons, upon your own ſuppoſition that they have the ſame common nature, are three

diſtinct Gods. On the other ſide, my notion of the unity of God is plain and clear, expreſsly confirmed by reaſon and Scripture. I can expreſs my faith in Scripture language, namely, *one Spirit, one Lord, one God and Father of all:* but you are obliged to expreſs your faith in language and forms, never heard of in the chriſtian church, till ſeveral hundred years after the days of the apoſtles. And as to your objection, that the notion of ſubordinate gods is abſolutely excluded by the expreſs words of God himſelf, who hath declared there is none other gods beſides himſelf; this declaration points out the impoſſibility of more ſupreme gods than one; it is conſiſtent with this declaration, that the title of gods ſhould be given to other beings in an inferior ſenſe, which is a plain Scripture fact. As the Holy Spirit is never ſtiled God in any ſenſe, the only thing to be accounted for on my ſide is this, how the title of God given to Chriſt, is conſiſtent with the acknowledgment of one God and Father of all; which is unanſwerably done by our Lord himſelf, by referring every thing to the honour of the Father. whom he ſtiles the only true God, as diſtinguiſhed from himſelf; he has likewiſe profeſſedly determined, that the notion of inferior gods is warranted by Scripture.

Thus I have impartially examined every material article you have advanced upon this head; and it muſt be left to the judgment of our readers to bring in the verdict according to evidence. It is obſervable that the evidence, as ſummed up in the Appeal, (2d edit. p. 82, 83.) remains unſhaken, and appears ſo plain and ſtrong even to yourſelf, that you have not ventured to ſet it before your readers, and then confront it with your own evi-

dence

dence on the other ſide. I have the ſati-faction to find upon a review, that all the material evidence on your ſide, is fairly produced in the Appeal, without ſuppreſſion, perverſion, or corruption, notwithſtanding the groundleſs charge you endeavour to fix upon me.

Upon the moſt impartial review my concluſion is this: if there be any truth that ſhines with diſtinguiſhed luſtre; if there be any doctrine of peculiar importance in natural and revealed religion, the unity of God in the literal ſenſe is certainly entitled to this glorious character. It is the voice of Moſes and the prophets; it is the voice of Chriſt and his apoſtles; it is the voice of reaſon, the voice of nature, that there is one, and but one ſupreme Lord and Governor of the world, one intelligent Being or Perſon of all poſſible perfection, from whom all other beings derive their exiſtence; by whoſe ſupreme authority the Son himſelf was ſent to bring men back to his God and Father, and the Holy Spirit employed in the guidance and ſanctification of the church of Chriſt. To this one ſupreme and all perfect Being, the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, be aſcribed all poſſible honour and glory by men and angels for ever and ever.

It is your duty, as a ſincere chriſtian, to take particular care that you do not employ your abilities, learning and character to hurt the grand principle of all religion, and to ſupport a doctrine really deſtructive of it.

As my firſt queſtion is clearly and ſolidly determined in favour of the real unity of God, my ſecond queſtion is of courſe decided; and conſequently, all you can ſay in defence of the Athanaſian

naſian worſhip muſt neceſſarily fall to the ground. But I am reſolved to attend you with my obſervations in every material article not already anſwered, and to give all poſſible ſatisfaction to common chriſtians upon this important ſubject.

I have already conſidered what you offer, with reſpect to the one God not ſignifying the perſon of the Father only; and likewiſe that God is the Father of all creatures in a different ſenſe from that of his being the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. Your repeated obſervation, that God, abſolutely taken, cannot be denominated a perſon, has been effectually overthrown: only I would add, that the God mentioned in Matth. iv. 10. whom the Jews worſhipped, and Satan acknowledged, is the perſon of the Father, which our Saviour himſelf has expreſsly determined, John viii. 54. and it is a notorious matter of fact, that the Jews were at that time ſtrict unitarians, that is, they worſhipped the ſame one ſupreme God whom Chriſt himſelf adored, without the leaſt thought of a plurality of perſons. I have likewiſe taken notice above of the infinite abſurdity you advance, when you interpret the word, *Father*, as ſignifying Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. Any unprejudiced chriſtian cannot poſſibly believe that, when our Lord directed his diſciples to pray in this form, *Our Father*, &c. this ſhould denote Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. The whole ſtrain of our Lord's Sermon upon the Mount, all his other diſcourſes, and the writings of the apoſtles, loudly proteſt againſt any ſuch notion. It is obſervable that, when our Lord ſpeaks expreſsly of the duty of prayer in his Sermon upon the Mount, he directs his diſciples to pray to the Father, but ſays nothing of praying to himſelf. But you affirm, that I have omitted one in-

inſtance of a prayer to Chriſt, Matth. vii. 21. Not every one that ſaith unto me, Lord, Lord, ſhall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doth the will of my Father which is in heaven. I never underſtood this to be a prayer, and it certainly is not: the plain meaning of it is this, Not every one who profeſſes himſelf a chriſtian, and makes an outward profeſſion of my religion, or acknowledges me for his Lord and Maſter, ſhall enter into the kingdom of heaven, &c. You cannot help acknowledging, that the word, *Father*, in this paſſage means the perſon of the Father, and every unprejudiced chriſtian cannot help acknowledging, that Father means the ſame perſon in the other paſſages of this Sermon; and, particularly, that Chriſt in this paſſage refers the whole buſineſs of our ſalvation to the honour of the Father, as the firſt and original author. As to the will of Chriſt being the ſame with the will of the Father, I have conſidered this above. (See Sincere Chriſtian's Anſwer, &c. p. 153, 154.)

You obſerve, that I have plainly miſtaken the difference between the worſhip of the Old and New Teſtament, becauſe I inferred from the collection of texts relating to worſhip, that the Jews were commanded to worſhip the one ſupreme God and him only; and in the New Teſtament chriſtians are commanded to worſhip the ſame one ſupreme God in the name of Chriſt. It is remarkable that you are obliged in effect to ſay the very ſame thing; and the difference is this only, that you do not allow the word ſupreme in the Old, or New Teſtament. But ſurely when God is ſtiled in the Old Teſtament the God of gods and Lord of lords, this neceſſarily implies the notion of ſupreme: and in the New Teſtament, when the Fa-

ther is ſtiled the only true God, the Lord God Almighty, the notion of ſupreme is plainly denoted. Beſides, God is deſcribed under the character of Moſt High in the Old and New Teſtament; and what does this ſtrictly mean but ſupreme?

Again, you are obliged to grant, that "the general courſe of the Goſpel-worſhip is addreſſed to the perſon of the Father in the name of Jeſus Chriſt, through the guidance of the Holy Spirit." I take a particular ſatisfaction in giving my aſſent to this Goſpel-worſhip, as being, according to your account, plainly founded on the commands of Chriſt and the example of the apoſtles; this form of worſhip is, indeed, ſo plainly revealed, that all chriſtians are uniformly agreed in it. In the name of God, as we are ſo far agreed, let us endeavour to ſettle this point in the ſpirit of peace and charity, which, one would think, might eaſily be done by thoſe, who profeſs themſelves ſincere diſciples of Chriſt, and conſequently under the ſtrongeſt obligations to follow the plain directions of the word of God. As, on the one ſide, a ſincere chriſtian is obliged in duty to profeſs and practiſe in religious matters, according to the expreſs determination of Chriſt and his apoſtles; ſo, on the other hand, it is his duty to reject all religious profeſſions and worſhip appointed by the authority of man, without any warrant from, or in oppoſition to, the word of God.

You obſerve "that the peculiar name and eſſential attributes of the one God, being plainly given in the New Teſtament to two other perſons beſides the perſon of the Father, and theſe three being notwithſtanding declared to be one, it is directly and fairly inferred, that the one God comprehends

prehends theſe three perſons. The adoration and worſhip therefore addreſſed to this one God, is equa ly addreſſed to the three perſons."

Anſ. It has been already proved, that the one God never ſignifies the three perſons, but the Father only; and conſequently, the worſhip addreſſed to the one God, is not addreſſed to the three perſons, but the Father only. I ſuppoſe you muſt mean that, when the worſhip of the one God is ſet forth without any expreſs mention of the Son and Holy Spirit, the worſhip of the three perſons is implied: for you cannot bear the groſs abſurdity of including the Son and Holy Spirit in the notion of God, when the three perſons are mentioned together. But let us take any act of worſhip directed to God without the mention of the Son and Holy Spirit: for inſtance, Revel. iv. 11. *Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power; for thou haſt created all things, and for thy pleaſure they are, and were created.* I cannot help judging, that, *thou, O Lord*, is very unaccountable language, and inconſiſtent with common ſenſe, if directed to three perſons. Such an interpretation of Scripture ſhould carefully be avoided, unleſs it was clearly eſtabliſhed by the general tenor of the ſacred writings, and the neceſſary conſtruction of the paſſages, where we have an account of worſhip. Whereas, on the other ſide, this interpretation is expreſsly contradicted by great numbers of plain paſſages, and is not warranted by one clear inſtance in the ſacred writings.

It is maintained in the Appeal, that the worſhip paid to Chriſt, according to Scripture, is an inferior worſhip. On the other ſide, you contend, that there is not the leaſt foundation for this diſtinction in Scripture. Let the cauſe be impartially re-

reviewed. In order to determine this important point, I had recourse to *all* the Scripture forms of worſhip mentioned in the New Teſtament, and thought it my duty, as a chriſtian, to pay a greater regard to them, than to forms of worſhip eſtabliſhed by the greateſt authority upon earth.

Acts i. 24. It has been thought doubtful whether this ſhort prayer was directed to God, or Chriſt; and therefore I fairly repreſented the caſe on both ſides. But let it be a prayer directed to Chriſt, and it is an example of worſhip paid to Chriſt, with regard to an office in which he was particularly concerned, as obſerved in the Appeal.

Upon this you expoſtulate the caſe: "Is not Chriſt particularly concerned in all other matters relating to his church, who is the head thereof? Is he not particularly concerned in the creation and preſervation of all things, in whom, and by whom, and for whom all things were created, and in whom all things conſiſt? and can a perſon thus equally and jointly concerned with the Father for the benefit of his church and for the happineſs of mankind, be entitled only to an inferior worſhip? and that too not extended to all, but only to a few particular caſes?" p. 157.

Anſ. Certain it is that Chriſt is the Head of the church, and is concerned, but not equally with the ſupreme Father, for the ſalvation of men. Chriſtians ſhould always conſider the great Being, from whom this exalted honour was derived: it was *God that made Jeſus Lord and Chriſt*; it was *God that ſet him at his own right hand*——*and gave him to be the Head over all things*. It muſt entirely depend upon the revealed will of God, whether it be our duty to make any particular acknow-

acknowledgments to Chriſt in his abſence upon this account. It is obſervable that though Chriſt be probably thought to have been employed by God in the creation of the world, yet there is not one inſtance of any ſort of worſhip directed to him, upon account of the part he bore in the creation; and therefore I think it unlawful to worſhip him as an inſtrument in the creation. That the worſhip paid to Chriſt in the New Teſtament, is of an inferior nature, undeniably appears from what has been juſt obſerved, namely, that *God made him Head of the church*, and conſequently, it cannot be of ſo high a nature, as that which is directed to the one ſupreme God, from whom all the honour due to Chriſt is derived, and to whoſe glory it redounds.

Your way of arguing, with reſpect to Chriſt's knowledge, has been anſwered above. What you obſerve about religious worſhip (p. 158, 159) ſhall be conſidered, when I examine the whole of what you advanced upon this ſubject.

Acts vii. 59 this is repreſented in the Appeal as an undoubted inſtance of worſhip paid directly to Chriſt, and conſequently, a prayer to Chriſt, though the word, *prayer*, is not mentioned: but ſurely invoking and worſhipping Chriſt, neceſſarily implies the act of praying; and therefore your inſinuation, as if I did not acknowledge this ſhort petition to be a prayer, is groundleſs.

You aſk, "is it to be ſuppoſed that a man in the agonies of a painful death, and full of the Holy Ghoſt, would neglect, in the moſt proper manner, to call upon God, if he thought his calling upon the Lord Jeſus was not as effectually the ſame, as calling upon God."

Anſ.

Anſ. The true reaſon of St. Stephen's praying to Chriſt upon this particular occaſion, was becauſe he had the extraordinary favour ſhewn him of ſeeing Jeſus ſtanding at the right hand of God: upon this it was natural for him to reſign his ſoul into the hands of Jeſus, upon whoſe account he ſuffered this painful death. That St. Stephen invoked him, not as God ſupreme, but as Mediator, undeniably appears from the circumſtances of the viſion; *I ſee the heavens opened*, ſays he, *and Jeſus ſtanding on the right hand of God.*

You endeavour to invalidate this plain account by obſerving that "Chriſt is as truly the Son of God, as he is truly the Son of man, by as truly partaking the divine as the human nature; thereby becoming in the two natures, a perfect and equal Mediator between God and man: even his mediatorſhip then implies his divine nature; and, therefore, upon this account adorable with true religious worſhip due to the divine Being. But ſuppoſe the dying martyr invoked him only in the appellant's ſenſe of mediator; would his addreſs be proper? would he not rather have ſaid, Lord Jeſus intercede with God to receive my ſpirit, and not to have directly prayed to Chriſt for what he knew he could not grant him without the permiſſion of God the Father; and which he alſo knew would not be obtained, if his petition was not immediately directed in the proper form to the proper perſon? on the contrary, he plainly ſaw the glory of God, and Jeſus ſtanding at the right hand of God, the Son upon an equal footing with the Father: he therefore addreſſes the Lord Jeſus, well knowing that in praying to him, he prayed to the Father alſo." p. 159, 160.

Anſ.

Anſ. Your notion of Chriſt's divine and human nature, deduced from his character of Son of God, has been effectually overthrown above. And when you take it for granted, that Chriſt could not be a perfect Mediator between God and man, unleſs he had a divine and human nature, you are anſwered by the plain Scripture account, Moſes being expreſsly ſtiled, Gal. iii. 19. mediator between God and the Jewiſh people.

St. Stephen, who laid down his life for Chriſt, was well aſſured that God had raiſed him to ſupereminent honour, of which he had now ocular demonſtration; and therefore he might very properly reſign his ſpirit into the hands of Chriſt, when he ſaw him inveſted with full power to defend and protect his true diſciples: the permiſſion of God to Chriſt to grant him his requeſt, clearly appeared by the viſion itſelf. But when you infer, that Chriſt is upon an equal footing with God, becauſe he is repreſented as ſtanding at the right hand of God, you may with equal reaſon infer the ſame thing with reſpect to the angels of God; for they are ſet forth in Scripture *as ſtanding by him on his right hand and on his left*, 1 Kings xxii. 19. You add, that "St. Stephen addreſſes the Lord Jeſus, well knowing that in praying to him, he prayed to the Father alſo." I allow this in a qualified ſenſe: as St. Stephen knew that Chriſt had full power given him by God to convey his ſpirit into a ſtate of happineſs, his praying to him was the ſame thing in effect as praying to the Father, from whom the power originally came. But if you mean that praying to Chriſt in all caſes is the ſame thing as praying to the Father, becauſe they are one and the ſame Being; or that praying to Chriſt as Mediator, implies him to be equal in ho-

honour to the ſupreme Father who appointed him; this ſenſe is expreſly contradicted by the plain declarations of Scripture, as I have already ſhewn with reſpect to the former part; and as to the latter, a mediator who is expreſsly declared to be raiſed to this office by God, cannot, conſiſtently with common ſenſe, be imagined to be equal to God who made him what he is. Beſides, the office of a mediator between God and man, neceſſarily ſignifies an inferiority to God. For whether a mediator denotes a perſon, who, in the eſtabliſhment of a covenant, is employed by God as a meſſenger, or interpreter of his will; or a perſon, who tranſacts the affairs, or pleads the cauſe, of men with God, he is certainly inferior to God in both reſpects.

Again, you obſerve "that St. Stephen not only prayed for himſelf, but likewiſe his very murderers. If Chriſt then was only Mediator in the appellant's ſenſe, the abſolute power of remitting ſins, which this prayer notwithſtanding fully implies, could not be in the Son of man, he being only interceſſor with God for them; and yet the Son of man while upon earth, inſiſted upon this power; and now in heaven, it is here plainly and directly attributed to him." p. 160.

Anſ. It is not certain that St. Stephen in this petition invoked, or prayed to, Chriſt, it being reaſonable to believe that the dying martyr imitated his bleſſed Lord in the object, as well as ſubject, of his petition. The hiſtorian obſerves, that St. Stephen, after having reſigned his ſoul into the hands of Chriſt, kneeled down and cried with a loud voice, *Lord, lay not this ſin to their charge*, which probably was directed to God the Father, it being exactly parallel in ſentiment to Chriſt's requeſt upon

upon the croſs, *Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do*, Luke xxiii. 34. But upon ſuppoſition that St Stephens's petition was directed to Chriſt, it does not follow from hence, that he has the abſolute power of remitting ſins, it being expreſsly declared, that the power of remitting ſins, which he exerciſed upon earth, was given him by the Father.

1 Tim. i. 12.

In the Appeal a different reading is taken notice of in ſome old manuſcripts, and which, indeed, is more agreeable to St. Paul's manner in other paſſages. You do not deny the fact, but contend earneſtly for the common reading; which being admitted, as obſerved in the Appeal, is an inſtance of St. Paul's making an acknowledgment to Chriſt for the office of an apoſtle, which he received immediately from him. I expreſſed in ſhort what you have enlarged upon from the acts of the apoſtles, relating to the converſion of St. Paul. It will be proper to conſider ſome particular texts intermixed in your account.

St. Paul in the firſt verſe of this chapter, namely, 1 Tim. i. ſtiles himſelf *an apoſtle of Chriſt by the commandment of God our Saviour, and our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*. You read the words thus; *an apoſtle of Chriſt, according to the appointment of God, our Saviour, and Lord Jeſus Chriſt*. Your view is to inſinuate, that Chriſt is called God our Saviour, as well as our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, becauſe it was by his immediate appointment that he became an apoſtle. *Anſ.* Upon ſuppoſition that God our Saviour ſignifies Chriſt, St. Paul has, in the beginning of this epiſtle, omitted the mention of God the Father, in expreſs contradiction to his uſual

me-

method in his other epiſtles; which ſeems at firſt view highly improbable. Your obſervation, that St. Paul became an apoſtle by the immediate appointment of Chriſt, has no weight, he having frequently ſtiled himſelf *an apoſtle of Chriſt by the will of God*, which is of the ſame import with this expreſſion, *an apoſtle of Chriſt by the commandment of God our Saviour, and Lord Jeſus Chriſt:* Chriſt indeed was the immediate miniſter by whom St. Paul was called to be an apoſtle: but we are expreſsly aſſur d, that this commiſſion was derived from the will of God. Remarkable it is, that God our Saviour is a title always applied to the Father in the New Teſtament, and never to Chriſt. Tit. iii. 4—6. *The love of God our Saviour——through Jeſus Chriſt our Saviour.* God is here repreſented as our Saviour in the higheſt ſenſe, as being the original author of our ſalvation, and the title of Saviour is at the ſame time conſiſtently given to Chriſt, becauſe he is the inſtrument or miniſter, whom God employed for the accompliſhment of our ſalvation. See likewiſe Luke i. 47. 1 Tim. ii. 3. iv. 10. Tit. i. 3.—ii. 10. Jud. 25. From theſe paſſages it undeniably appears, that God our Saviour always denotes the perſon of the Father, though the title of Saviour is given to Chriſt in an inferior ſenſe. Thus other perſons have been likewiſe ſtiled Saviours in the Old Teſtament, whom God raiſed up to ſave his people Iſrael, Judg. iii. 9. 2 Kings xiii. 5. Nehem. ix. 27.

You interpret the God of our fathers of Chriſt, Acts xxii. 14. It is but turning to the chapter and verſe, and your miſtake immediately appears to the moſt careleſs reader. For not to obſerve that the God of our fathers neceſſarily means the perſon of the Father, this character being never ap-

plied to Chriſt; the God of our fathers is expreſsly diſtinguiſhed from Chriſt in the verſe itſelf, who is called the juſt one. And he, (namely Ananias,) ſaid, *The God of our fathers hath choſen thee, that thou ſhouldſt* know his will, and *ſee that juſt One, and ſhouldſt hear the voice of his mouth.* As for the exhortation of Ananias in the 16th verſe of this chapter, *be baptized, and waſh away thy ſins, calling on the name of the Lord*; the Lord here doubtleſs ſignifies Chriſt, and *the calling on the name of the Lord*, generally means the profeſſion of Chriſt's religion, and ſometimes probably the direct invocation of him. But when St. Paul in the 17th verſe ſpeaks of his praying in the temple at Jeruſalem, which was a conſiderable time after his converſion, this has no neceſſary relation to the calling on the name of the Lord in the 16th verſe, as it was the general practice of the apoſtle to bow his knees to the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. Though Chriſt appeared to him, whilſt he prayed, this does not prove, as you ſeem to take it for granted, that his prayers were directed to Chriſt: the extraordinary favour of this viſion was granted to St. Paul in conſequence of his praying; juſt as Cornelius had the viſion of an angel, whilſt he was offering up prayers to God.

Again, you interpret the worſhip of the God of my fathers, Acts xxiv. 14. of Chriſt, becauſe the Jews called the chriſtian profeſſion an hereſy. In anſwer to this charge, St. Paul profeſſes to worſhip the ſame God whom the Jewiſh people did: *the God of my fathers* is a character never applied to Chriſt. On the other hand, Acts v. 30. the God of our fathers is expreſsly diſtinguiſhed from Jeſus: *the God of our fathers raiſed up Jeſus.* With reſpect to your obſervation, that Chriſt is

deſcribed, in the epiſtle to the Hebrews, as the eternal and immutable creator of all things, the contrary has been ſhewn above.

You infer from your whole account relating to St. Paul's converſion by Chriſt, that "it is highly probable, that the ſolemn thankſgiving and praiſe in the 17th verſe of 1 Tim. i. is offered to the three perſons, united in the Godhead, becauſe, Galat. i. 15. it is ſaid, that the Father ſeparated St. Paul from his mother's womb, which yet is attributed to the Holy Spirit, Acts xiii. 2. the divine nature of the Son being the ſame inviſible nature with the Father's and Holy Spirit's and only through the veil of his fleſh made manifeſt to the world." p. 161.

Anſ. St. Paul ſpeaks of God the Father as having ſeparated him to the office of an apoſtle; the Holy Ghoſt is repreſented as ſaying, ſeparate me Saul; and Chriſt is fully ſet forth, as being particularly concerned in his converſion and apoſtleſhip; therefore the Father, Chriſt, and the Holy Spirit are three perſons and one God. This way of arguing has been effectually confuted in the courſe of the debate. Almighty God is frequently deſcribed in Scripture as doing that which he immediately accompliſhes by inferior agents. I have likewiſe obſerved, that the ſame way of arguing will equally prove, that God, angels, prophets and apoſtles, are the ſame being; for the ſame things are ſometimes attributed to theſe different perſons that are to God. But let the ſolemn thankſgiving and praiſe in the 17th verſe be produced: now *unto the King eternal, immortal, inviſible, the only wiſe God, be honour, and glory, for ever and ever.* That the King eternal ſhould ſignify three eternal kings, and at the ſame time one eter-

eternal king; that the only wiſe God ſhould ſignify three wiſe gods, and at the ſame time one wiſe God, which muſt be your interpretation when reduced to plain Engliſh, is ſuch a groſs perverſion of language and ſentiment, that it has no other tendency but to expoſe the Scripture doctrine to the ſcoffs of prophane and ſceptical men. The term, *inviſible*, is always applied in every other paſſage to the Father; and in ſome paſſages the Father is expreſsly diſtinguiſhed from Chriſt by this very character, which is never applied to Chriſt. Again, St. Paul's doxology in Rom. xvi. 27. plainly demonſtrates, that the ſupreme Father is the perſon, to whom this is directed. *To God only wiſe be glory through Jeſus Chriſt for ever.* The Father is here neceſſarily meant, according to your own rule of interpreting Scripture; and therefore this doxology in 1 Tim. i. 17. is aſcribed to the Father.

It is obſerved in the Appeal (2d edit. p. 99.) that we have an account of a new worſhip eſtabliſhed by the authority of God in the 5th chapter of Revelation, namely, the worſhip of Chriſt under the character of a Lamb; and likewiſe the reaſon upon which it was appointed, namely, becauſe he *was ſlain.*

On the other hand, "you can ſee no foundation for its being called a new worſhip, but that the heavenly hoſt is ſaid to ſing a new ſong. And if it is to be underſtood a new kind of worſhip on that account, whenever in the Old Teſtament a new ſong is ſung to God, we may equally ſay a new kind of worſhip is thereby eſtabliſhed." p. 162.

Anſ. A new ſong does not indeed prove the worſhip to be new; the ſongs in the Old Teſta-

ment were directed to the ſame object, and uſed upon account of ſome new matter of thankſgiving. But the new ſong in the Revelation neceſſarily implies a new worſhip, as being ſung to a new object, a perſon who had never been invoked before by the heavenly hoſt; and likewiſe it was ſung upon a new account with regard to the object and the worſhippers, namely, the redemption of man by Jeſus Chriſt.

You propoſe to me the following queries: "is this the firſt inſtance of worſhip paid to Chriſt? Did not his diſciples worſhip him, even with proſtration immediately before, and after his aſcenſion? Was he not worſhipped by the apoſtles, Acts i. 24. not merely becauſe he was ſlain, &c. but becauſe he is acquainted with our moſt inmoſt thoughts? Doth not St. Stephen worſhip him, in particular, even at the point of death; though the glory of God the Father was fully diſplayed to him at the ſame time? and doth he not addreſs him by the particular name of Jeſus? which plainly implies the reaſon for which his humanity is exalted to the right hand of God; and which, therefore, if it made the worſhip of an inferior kind, muſt alſo have rendered it leſs effectual than praying to the Father. Doth not, again, St. Paul aſſure us, Philipp. ii. that this worſhip, upon this very account, was appointed previouſly to the time of this viſion; at the ſame time that he informs us, that this perſon who for our ſakes, took upon him the form of a ſervant, &c. was, before this his voluntary humiliation, in the form of God, equal with God; and therefore entitled to equal honour and worſhip? Is not the higheſt worſhip and honour paid to Chriſt, upon this very account, in the beginning of this Revelation? It cannot

then

then be only now firſt appointed, upon Chriſt's taking the book out of his Father's hand, in the appearance of a lamb." p. 162.

Anſ. The main purport of theſe queries is to ſhew, that the worſhip of Chriſt was practiſed by chriſtians before the time aſſigned in this viſion of St. John. My plain account drawn from the 5th chap. of Revelation, does not imply that Chriſt was never worſhipped in any reſpect before: the diſciples, who ſaw him after his reſurrection and before his aſcenſion, are ſaid to have held him by the feet, and to have worſhipped him; which might be nothing more at that time than an high degree of civil reſpect and honour, the word, *worſhip*, being uſed in this ſenſe in ſeveral paſſages of Scripture. (See Appeal, 2d edit. p. 107.) With reſpect to the other inſtances of worſhip as previous to the time of St. John's viſion, it may be obſerved, that the grand deſign of this viſion was to ſet forth the peculiar circumſtances of Chriſt's ſupereminent glory for the information of the chriſtian church in all ages: that whereas true believers had been worſhippers of the Lord God and him only; ſo now they ſhould pay an inferior worſhip to Chriſt upon account of his humiliation and merits, the angels themſelves being made ſubject to him, who are repreſented as joining in a ſolemn act of worſhip to the lamb that was ſlain. We cannot preciſely determine the time of this grand affair merely from the viſion of St. John: it ſeems highly reaſonable to ſuppoſe that the general matter of it was tranſacted immediately upon our Lord's aſcenſion into heaven, though the particulars of it were not revealed till many years afterwards to St. John. In the caſe of viſions, tranſactions of every kind, whether paſt or future, are repreſented to

the mind of the prophet in ſuch a manner, as if they were actually preſent. It is expreſsly declared by the other apoſtles, who wrote long before the Revelation of St. John, that Chriſt was exalted to extraordinary dignity upon his aſcenſion into heaven: Mark xvi. 19. Acts vii. 35. Philipp. ii. 9, 10, 11. Heb. i. 3. 6. 1 Pet. iii. 22. From theſe and ſeveral other paſſages it plainly appears, that all the apoſtles were well aſſured of Chriſt's exalted ſtate by the Spirit of God; and it ſeems highly probable, that he was inveſted with this ſupereminent honour upon his firſt aſcenſion into heaven; in conſequence of which the apoſtles invoked him upon ſome particular occaſions, and aſcribed glory directly to him: ſo that the ſolemn inauguration of Chriſt referred to in St. John's viſion, was very probably tranſacted many years before the time of the viſion itſelf. And as all the apoſtles had the knowledge of this grand affair communicated to them; ſo the peculiar circumſtances relating to it, were more particularly revealed to St. John in the iſle of Patmos; and more eſpecially that part of Chriſt's ſupereminent honour conferred on him by God for his extraordinary merits, whereby he was enabled to reveal the future ſtate of the church to the final conſummation of all things.

Your obſervation, with reſpect to St. Stephen's petition, has been anſwered above; and ſo likewiſe has your inference, that Chriſt is entitled to equal worſhip with God, becauſe he is ſaid to have been in the form of God, and equal with God, according to our Engliſh tranſlation.

It is obſerved in the Appeal, that the worſhip of Chriſt is an inferior worſhip for this plain reaſon, expreſsly ſet forth, namely, that *he was ſlain and*

redeemed us to God; Revel. v. 9. which is of ſuch a nature as cannot be offered to the one ſupreme God, by whoſe authority the Son himſelf was ſent to take our nature upon him; and by whoſe favour he was exalted to the dignity of receiving homage from the ſaints in heaven and in earth, upon account of his extraordinary merits.

On the other ſide you maintain, "that if the motives and grounds of religious worſhip can at all alter and affect the nature of the worſhip itſelf, what higher motive can be aſſigned to rational creatures, than that of being redeemed from eternal miſery? Than that the only begotten Son of God condeſcending to take our nature upon him, and freely ſubmitting to be ſent, and undergo a ſtate of miſery, in order to raiſe us from the death of ſin, to the life of righteouſneſs? But after all the Appellant is obliged to acknowledge, the worſhip paid to Chriſt to be a part of the ſame worſhip paid to God the Father: but, if, properly ſpeaking, a part, how then can it be of an inferior, or different kind?" Page 163.

Anſ. The redemption purchaſed for us by Chriſt, is doubtleſs the greateſt bleſſing we are capable of receiving: but the ſacred writers have taken particular care, to aſcribe this infinite bleſſing to the ſupreme authority of the one God and Father of all, who is conſtantly repreſented as the original ſource of our ſalvation; and we are taught and commanded to make our ſolemn acknowledgements to him, for all that Chriſt did and ſuffered for us: we are likewiſe authorized to make proper acknowledgments to Chriſt, as being the inſtrument, through whom God has diſpenſed the ineſtimable mercy of our redemption; we worſhip him, becauſe *he was ſlain, and hath redeemed us to*

God. Common ſenſe muſt convince all unprejudiced Chriſtians, that this worſhip cannot be of ſo high a nature, as the ſolemn adoration of the one ſupreme God, by whoſe authority the Son was ſent, and to whoſe favour it is owing, that any particular acknowledgments are made to Chriſt at all; which acknowledgments, as we are expreſsly aſſured by St. Paul, redound to the glory of God the Father: and therefore, I juſtly called it part of the worſhip of the one ſupreme God; from whence you infer it cannot be of an inferior, or different kind. It is in this ſenſe a part, becauſe the worſhip of Chriſt is not a ſeparate independent worſhip of the perſon of Chriſt, but it is practiſed by the command of God, and to his ultimate glory: it is of an inferior, or different kind, becauſe it is infinitely abſurd to ſuppoſe that the ſupreme God ſhould be worſhipped upon account of his humiliation and ſufferings, and to the glory of another perſon.

You allow "the obſervation, with which the remarks of the Appellant are concluded, had it been juſt, might have ſtood him in ſome ſtead; but the acknowledgments of praiſe and glory, which are ſet forth as given to the Lamb, do not entirely end where he is pleaſed to ſtop, namely, at the 12th verſe; the 13th verſe raiſes them, if poſſible, yet higher; ſhewing the former, to be given to him upon an equal footing with the Father; the Lamb here being joined with the Father, equally the object of the praiſes of the whole univerſe; to which the four Beaſts ſolemnly aſſenting, the four and twenty Elders immediately fall down, and worſhip him that liveth for ever and ever.—— But after the whole univerſe had thus jointly worſhipped in the moſt ſolemn manner,

manner, the Father and Son; is it to be thought the four and twenty Elders fell down only to worſhip the Father? Did they not before proſtrate themſelves in the ſame manner to the Son, to the Lamb? But the Appellant ſays, the perſon whom they now fall down to worſhip, is particularly determined to be the Father, by the character of him, who liveth for ever and ever, aſcribed to God, who ſat upon the throne, in the ſolemn worſhip, at the cloſe of the 4th chapter.—— But the deſcription of God in this chapter, is far from determining the worſhip to be paid to the Father alone. It has been clearly ſhewn, that the character, *Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come*, belongs equally to Father, Son, and Holy Spirit: and as to the peculiar character of living for ever and ever, the abſolute eternity of Son and Holy Spirit, clearly ſet forth in Scripture, equally entitles them to it; but in particular with regard to the Son, Chriſt appropriates this very character to himſelf, chap. i. 18. where he ſays, *I am he that liveth, and was dead; and lo, I am he that liveth for ever and ever:* the words there in the original, being exactly the ſame with the words here." Pages 163, 164.

Anſ. In my collection of texts relating to the worſhip of Chriſt, the 13th verſe is ſet down; and it is a ſatisfaction upon a review, that you cannot charge me with omitting one undoubted inſtance of worſhip paid to Chriſt, in Scripture. When I ſummed up the evidence ariſing from this collection of texts, I ſtopped at the 12th verſe, the 13th being not abſolutely neceſſary to eſtabliſh the point in view. However, let it be conſidered: bleſſing and honour, *&c.* are aſcribed to God and the Lamb by the whole univerſe, from whence you infer,

infer, that they are upon an equal footing, and equally the object of the praiſes of the whole univerſe. Notwithſtanding, the particular care taken by the ſacred writers, to ſecure the ſupremacy of the one God and Father of all, you labour to confound a plain caſe evident to eye-ſight, ver. 9. *They ſung a new ſong, ſaying, Thou art worthy —— for thou waſt ſlain, and haſt redeemed* us *to God by thy blood.* ver. 12. *Worthy is the Lamb that was ſlain, to receive power, and honour and glory: then the whole univerſe* aſcribe *bleſſing to him that ſitteth upon the throne,* that is, the one ſupreme God, *and unto the Lamb.* Here the character of the Lamb is particularly mentioned, in order to point out the true foundation of this extraordinary honour, which was diſtinctly ſet forth at the 9th and 12th verſes. And if you are reſolved, that the worſhip of Chriſt, becauſe he was ſlain, ſhall denote the ſame thing with the worſhip of the Lord God Almighty, who ſent the Son, and gave him this honour upon account of his humiliation and ſufferings, you muſt be left to your own judgment: but common ſenſe, to which you are obliged ſometimes to appeal, loudly proteſts againſt your judgment.

You endeavour to ſhew, that the four and twenty Elders, ver. 14. when they are repreſented as worſhipping *him that liveth for ever and ever,* worſhiped Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. Your reaſons are theſe: you profeſs to have proved, that *the Lord God Almighty which was, and is, and is to come,* ſignifies Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt: on the contrary, I have plainly ſhewn the infinite abſurdity of this interpretation. Again, you obſerve that the abſolute eternity of the Son and Holy Spirit, clearly ſet forth in Scripture, equally entitle

title them to the peculiar character of living for ever and ever: on the other ſide, it has been clearly proved from Scripture, in the courſe of this debate, that the Son and Holy Spirit are not abſolutely eternal. With reſpect to your obſervation, that the Son appropriates this very character to himſelf, chap. i. 18. *I am he that liveth and was dead; and lo, I am alive for evermore*; this is extremely different from the character, as applied to God in the abſolute conſtruction: Chriſt ſpeaks of himſelf as having been dead, and being now alive for ever and ever, which may in a lower ſenſe be applied to the ſaints after their reſurrection. But when the Father is deſcribed under the character of living for ever and ever, it manifeſtly denotes his abſolute and independent eternity; and likewiſe, that he is the original ſource of life to all other beings.

Your laſt obſervation upon this article deſerves particular notice. "After the full repreſentation of the glory of God, chap. 4. in the 5th chap. the Lamb is deſcribed as making his firſt appearance in the midſt of the throne, iſſuing forth from the boſom of the Father, where the ſame Apoſtle John i. 18. tells us, he conſtantly is, the perſonal diſtinction being before concealed in the unapproachable light, in which the Godhead dwelleth, and now expreſſed by the emblematical figure of a ſacrificed Lamb; as that of the Holy Spirit is already ſet forth under the myſtical appearance of ſeven lamps; and now again by the ſeven eyes of the Lamb, to ſhew it to be equally the ſpirit of the Father and Son. This circumſtance duly conſidered, muſt ſhew every reaſonable man, from whence the Lamb on a ſudden appeared in the midſt of the throne; and that the Lord God Al-

mighty, who before was deſcribed ſitting upon the throne, was not the Father alone, but Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, who, by your eſſential union, make the one God." Pages 164, 165.

Anſ. You prove nothing by ſuch far fetched imaginations, but a ſtrong diſpoſition to find your favourite doctrine in the concluſion, let the premiſes be what they will. In the 4th chapter the Lord God Almighty is repreſented in a very ſolemn manner, and with ſuch perſonal diſtinctions, as neceſſarily denote him to be one Perſon, who can be no other than the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt: *The Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come, who ſitteth on the throne, who liveth for ever and ever, Thou, O Lord, thou haſt created, thy pleaſure*; all theſe expreſſions, according to common ſenſe and language, undeniably ſet forth the notion of one Perſon. And as to the ſeven ſpirits of God, they are repreſented as ſeven lamps burning *before* the throne, and conſequently, they cannot be ſuppoſed to repreſent a perſon, included in the Lord God Almighty ſitting *upon* the throne. Beſides, I have already proved, that the ſeven Spirits are ſeven principal Angels, employed by God and Chriſt in various offices for the benefit of the church. With reſpect to Chriſt, there is not the leaſt diſtant intimation of the Son being included in the Lord God Almighty; he is not mentioned at all in any character, it being evidently the deſign of this part of the viſion to repreſent the worſhip of the Lord God Almighty, as diſtinguiſhed from the mediatorial worſhip paid to Chriſt in the following chapter. If your notion had been true, it would have been ſaid, that the Lamb iſſued forth from the throne on which God Almighty ſat, as being a perſon of the Godhead.

On

On the other hand, the text repreſents the Lamb as ſtanding in the midſt of the throne, and of the four beaſts, and in the midſt of the elders. Your notion of the Son's iſſuing forth from the Godhead upon the throne, is meer imagination, without the leaſt colour of evidence to ſupport it. The boſom of the Father, John i. 18. has no ſort of relation to the metaphyſical eſſence of the Godhead, of which you ſuppoſe Chriſt to partake, but plainly ſignifies that the Son * was admitted into the moſt ſecret deſigns of the Father, regarding the ſalvation of man.

Upon an attentive review of the circumſtance of the Lamb, mentioned in this 5th chapter of Revelation, I ſee a more rational account of it than you have offered: the Lamb makes his firſt appearance as ſtanding in the midſt of the throne, and of the four beaſts, and in the midſt of the elders, in order to point out his office of a mediator between God and man, the four beaſts and elders being evidently deſigned to repreſent the church. The viſions of this wonderful book are generally formed in alluſion to the Jewiſh diſpenſation. Joel ii. 17. As the prieſts are ordered to officiate between the porch and the altar, to make interceſſion for the people at the porch to God, whoſe favour and peculiar reſidence are repreſented by the altar; ſo Chriſt, as mediator, ſtands between God on the throne, and the beaſts and elders, denoting the Chriſtian church. Upon the whole, the Lord God Almighty who ſat upon the throne, is ſo far from being Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, that he is diſtinguiſhed from the Son in ſuch a way, as makes it infinitely impoſſible to conceive of Chriſt, as a perſon exiſting in the Lord

* Εις τον κολπον τȣ πατρος.

God

God Almighty; ſurely, a Lamb ſlain ſtanding in the midſt of the throne, muſt neceſſarily be a diſtinct being in every ſenſe, from the Lord God ſitting upon the throne.

You cloſe this article with propounding a few queſtions, which you think not capable of being ſolved upon the principles of the Appellant.

"May we pray to Chriſt, or not? Are we to pray to him though abſent? for if he be but a creature, he certainly may be abſent. Is he to be prayed to, or glorified by hymns, as a man? is not this creature-worſhip? Or is he to be prayed to as an Angel, though conſidered at the ſame time in his loweſt character? Doth this make it at all better? Or is it the union of the angelic nature with the human, that exalts both together into an object of adoration; or is it the will of the Father that doth this? Doth the Father will that a creature ſhould be adored in conjunction with himſelf by the whole univerſe? That an abſent creature ſhall be prayed to, though he doth not hear our prayers? Muſt Chriſt ſee in, or hear from God, the matter of our petitions, as the Papiſts ſay, the Angels and Saints do, before they intercede for us." Page 165.

Anſ. In the Appeal it is expreſsly granted, that it is lawful to pray to Chriſt as mediator, or redeemer, and to aſcribe glory directly to him, conſidered in that capacity: it is likewiſe granted, that Chriſt is perfectly acquainted with the wants of his people upon earth; and conſequently, we may pray to him, though abſent, as we have ſome examples of it in Scripture. As to the term, creature, on which you ſeem to lay a very great ſtreſs; I anſwer, that Chriſt is never ſtiled a creature in Scripture; but he is ſaid to be produced, derived,

derived, or created: and if this neceſſarily makes him a creature, though doubtleſs of a more exalted nature than any other being, the charge muſt fall upon the ſacred writers. Your queſtions proceed upon this ſuppoſition, that, if Chriſt was created by God, he ought not to be worſhipped, becauſe he may be abſent; if abſent, he cannot hear our prayers. Now this is directly oppoſing the ſupreme authority of almighty God; and remarkable it is, that the plain Scripture account contains a full anſwer to your queſtions. We are aſſured by the ſacred writers, that God hath raiſed Chriſt to an exalted ſtate, and made him an object of mediatorial worſhip, upon account of his humiliation and ſufferings: we are likewiſe told, that Chriſt hath received from God extraordinary power and knowledge, whereby he is perfectly qualified to be an object of inferior worſhip, to the glory of God the Father. When the higheſt honour is paid to Chriſt, he is repreſented at the very time of receiving it, under the character of a *Lamb that was ſlain:* this is certainly creature-worſhip according to your way of expreſſing it, and yet the Father hath willed and authorized it. It is your duty, as a ſincere Chriſtian, to be very cautious how you make ſuppoſitions that derogate from the authority of the one ſupreme God, as if he had no right to appoint an inferior worſhip; and as if he could not impart to an inferior being, ſuch degrees of power and knowledge, as would ſufficiently qualify him for this exalted honour.

Having thus given a direct anſwer to your queſtions, I now proceed to examine your objections to my account of the Holy Spirit, with regard to worſhip.

The

The argument urged in the Appeal, is plain and ſtrong: we have no warrant from Scripture, either by precept, or example, for putting up prayers, and aſcribing glory, directly to the perſon of the Holy Spirit; and therefore it cannot be the duty of a Chriſtian to practiſe this religious worſhip.

Now the true and only effectual method to anſwer this, is to produce an inſtance of prayer, praiſe, or glory, offered up to the Holy Spirit, as God, in Scripture. Let this be done, and my argument is overthrown. As to any inſtance of glory directly aſcribed to the Holy Spirit, you do not ſo much as pretend to affirm, that one example can be produced, as I obſerved of the learned in general. [See Appeal, 2d edit. p. 103.] But notwithſtanding this failure, you venture to pronounce, that the Holy Spirit is equally entitled to our prayers, praiſes, and thankſgivings, becauſe we are directed to baptize in his name, and to wiſh bleſſing from him. It has been already proved, that being baptized into the name of any perſon, does not imply the invocation of that perſon in prayer; for if it did, the Iſraelites being baptized into Moſes, which is of the ſame import with being baptized into his name, muſt imply their invoking Moſes in prayer, in direct oppoſition to the mind of the ſacred writers, and the practice of the Iſraelites. It has likewiſe been ſhewn, that grace and mercy are ſolemnly wiſhed from the ſeven ſpirits before the throne, whom I have proved to be angels, though no invocation of them is authorized by Scripture, but expreſsly forbid.

With reſpect to the ordinance of baptiſm, our Saviour gave a commiſſion to the Apoſtles to go and teach all nations, baptiſing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.

Ghoſt. In the Acts of the Apoſtles, baptiſm is repreſented as performed in the name of the Lord, and ſometimes in the name of the Lord Jeſus. From this account you infer, that "the term, Lord, equally means the three Perſons; and conſequently, the Holy Spirit equally called Lord with the other two: and again, when it is expreſſed by baptiſing in the name of Jeſus Chriſt, the name, Jeſus Chriſt, by the eſſential union of the three perſons, is repreſentatively put as implying the other two." Page 166.

Anſ. This ſtrange confuſion may be eaſily avoided by obſerving, that as Chriſtians are ſtiled, in ſhort, Diſciples of Chriſt, which neceſſarily implies the belief and acknowledgment, of the Father and the Holy Spirit whom Chriſt taught; ſo, when Chriſtians are ſaid to be baptiſed in the name of the Lord Jeſus, this is only a general expreſſion, implying their being baptiſed into the profeſſion of that religion which Chriſt had taught, and conſequently, is equivalent to the ſolemn profeſſion of their belief in God the Father Almighty, the Son, and Holy Spirit: the Son is particularly mentioned, becauſe he was the chief agent whom God employed in this important buſineſs, and likewiſe, becauſe believers were deſigned to be called by Chriſt's name.

You ſtile baptiſm an high act of religious worſhip: but this is not the language of Scripture; neither can it with ſtrict propriety be deemed ſo, either with regard to the perſon to whom it is adminiſtered, or the perſon who adminiſters it. Baptiſm is an external act of initiation into the church of Chriſt, whereby the perſon baptiſed ſolemnly profeſſes his faith in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, as they are revealed in Scripture;

and his obligation to pay ſuch religious regards to them, as are there required. Since therefore, the Holy Spirit is never directly worſhiped in Scripture, neither have we any command for this religious practiſe, our being baptiſed into his name, cannot imply any ſuch thing, but muſt ſignify our being baptiſed into his guidance and aſſiſtance, the Holy Spirit being the chief of the miniſtering Spirits, whom God and Chriſt employ for the benefit of the church. The Holy Spirit is not put upon an equal footing with God and Chriſt by being joined with them in the office of baptiſm, as I have ſhewn above. I have likewiſe anſwered what you here intimate of the neceſſary and equal concurrence of the three Perſons, to the working out our ſalvation. I have not trifled with the moſt ſacred things, as you charge me, but have fairly and honeſtly repreſented every thing for the edification of Chriſtian people. Becauſe I ſpeak of God and Chriſt governing the church, you infer that by this I raiſe Chriſt to an equal footing with God. But ſurely, as Chriſt governs the church by a commiſſion derived from God, the government may be juſtly applied to God, as the principal, and to Chriſt as an inferior Lord and head, acting under God the ſupreme Lord and governor, who appointed him. What you urge of God's being tied down to one inſtrument, rather than another, and of the Holy Spirit being ſet forth as a neceſſary diſpenſer of the graces of the Goſpel, as the Father and Son, has been fully and effectually anſwered above.

You cite 1 Cor. xii. 11. to prove, that the Holy Spirit is not an inferior inſtrument: "*All theſe* (namely, theſe manifold gifts reckoned up in the preceding verſes) *worketh the one and ſelf-ſame ſpirit,*

ſpirit, dividing to every man ſeverally as he will; not as God, as his ſuperior, willeth, but as he himſelf willeth. Is this the deſcription of an inſtrument acting entirely by the direction of another's will? Doth not his own will determine him here to do, what God is ſaid in the ſame manner to do, ver. 6? He ſurely then muſt be God, who acts of himſelf what God is ſaid to perform; and conſequently, as adorable as Father, or Son." Pages 167, 168.

Anſ. It has been obſerved above, that God is very properly ſaid to do what he performs by inferior agents. In the 6th verſe of this chapter, God is repreſented as the principal cauſe of the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit, through whom, as an inferior agent, they are diſpenſed for the benefit of the church, which is the true import of this expreſſion, *To one is given by, or through, the ſpirit, the word of wiſdom:* here the word *given* neceſſarily refers to God, as the original donor, and through the Spirit denotes him to be an inſtrument employed by God in this exalted office. If the context be examined, and the main view of the Apoſtle be conſidered, it will appear, that the true meaning of the Spirit's dividing to every man ſeverally as he will, has no ſort of relation to the point you want to eſtabliſh, namely, the ſupreme authority of the Spirit; but was evidently intended to ſhew, that one and the ſame Spirit performs theſe extraordinary operations, and that he does not impart them all to any one perſon, but diſtributes ſuch particular gifts as are adapted to each Chriſtian, according to his own diſcretion. When God employs an inferior agent in any office, he furniſhes him with powers ſufficient for the diſcharge of it. To infer that the

Holy Spirit is ſupreme, and acts independent of the will of the one ſupreme God, merely from this expreſſion, *dividing to every man ſeverally as he will*, is expreſsly contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture, which has determined, that the Holy Spirit is ſent, given, and employed by God and Chriſt in very high offices, and conſequently, is an inferior inſtrument. The weakneſs of the foundation, on which you build ſuch an important point, may be collected from this expreſſion of our Lord's, John iii. 8. *The wind bloweth where it liſteth.* Would you infer from hence, that the wind acts independently of God, and is not an inferior inſtrument under his direction? And when you think you have proved his ſupreme divinity, then you infer that he is as adorable as Father and Son. But this is attempting to prove a point by conſequences and deductions, which plainly ſhews the weakneſs of your cauſe: a plain Chriſtian duty, ſuch as that of prayer, cannot be reaſonably conceived to depend upon conſequential arguings, which are often fallacious, but ought to be ſet forth clearly and fully: if it was our duty to offer up prayers to the Holy Spirit, it would have been as plainly expreſſed in Scripture, as it is in our Litany.

But you add, "Perhaps it will yet appear, that the Scriptures repreſent him to be actually, and perſonally adored and prayed to." Page 168.

Anſ. You do well to ſay *perhaps*; for you muſt know that every thing you can produce, has been frequently conſidered.

The evidence you draw from Scripture, is this: "The ſolemn wiſh of St. Paul, 2 Cor. xiii. 14. which yet we have ſhewn to be a real and effectual prayer, the Appellant allows to be a ſolemn addreſs

dreſs to Chriſt and God; but that the remainder is not an addreſs directly to the Holy Spirit, to grant his communion, or fellowſhip, to the Corinthians, but a continued addreſs to the other two to grant it for him. Now what can be more evaſive, or diſingenuous, than this? The Appellant has but juſt now allowed, that we are directed by Scripture to wiſh bleſſing from him; and immediately, in the only one inſtance he produces for it, he denies any ſuch direction to be at all contained: and why pray? Becauſe there is nothing here expreſſed by St. Paul, proper to be given to the Corinthians by the Spirit. What? was it not proper for the Holy Spirit to give to them the communion of himſelf, the fellowſhip, the joint participation of his comfort and graces? Are not theſe the peculiar gifts of the Holy Spirit? Who is ſo proper to give them, to vouchſafe his ſociety to them, as the Holy Spirit himſelf? And as diſtinct favours are evidently prayed for, from Chriſt and God the Father, no more proper to be granted by each, than the communion of the Holy Spirit by himſelf; why, if each of the former is ſuppoſed, notwithſtanding, to be properly addreſſed, ſhould not the Holy Spirit alſo? And therefore, as hath been already proved before, this, and all ſuch addreſſes are really prayers; and the Holy Spirit is here prayed to equally, with the Father and Son." Pages 168, 169.

Anſ. It has been ſhewn above, that this is a ſolemn wiſh and not a prayer. What you have added here, is founded upon a conceſſion you ſuppoſe made in the Appeal, namely, that the grace of Chriſt, and the love of God, are allowed to be a ſolemn addreſs to Chriſt and God: from whence you argue, that the communion of the Holy

Ghoſt, muſt be likewiſe a direct addreſs to him. My expreſs words in the Appeal (2d edit. p. 102.) are theſe: St. Paul mentions the communion of the Holy Ghoſt in this paſſage, to ſhew after what manner he *earneſtly wiſhed* that God and Chriſt would teſtify their love and favour to the Corinthians, by imparting to them the Holy Ghoſt. So that you have evidently miſ-repreſented my ſenſe, in oppoſition to my expreſs words, it being plainly affirmed in the Appeal, that the whole is a ſolemn wiſh of St. Paul, that the favour of Chriſt, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghoſt, or, the joint-partaking of the Holy Spirit, might be, and continue with the Corinthians. And this is undeniably, the true meaning of the Apoſtle's words, the form of the expreſſion being inconſiſtent with the notion of praying, to which you have given no anſwer.

With reſpect to your queſtions ariſing from my obſervation, that St. Paul has mentioned nothing proper to be given to the Corinthians by the Spirit, I anſwer, that the Scripture language is quite different. We never read of the Holy Ghoſt giving to Chriſtians the communion of himſelf; but he is expreſsly ſaid to be given by God, which always implies the peculiar graces of the Spirit: and in this paſſage the communion of the Holy Ghoſt neceſſarily ſignifies, according to the uſe of the Greek word in other places, their being joint partakers of the Holy Spirit himſelf, or the Spirit being given to them, and conſequently, his graces. Again, admitting that the communion of the Holy Ghoſt, does not imply a wiſh of bleſſing from him; yet as bleſſing is wiſhed from the ſeven Spirits before the throne, I might conſiſtently allow that bleſſing is wiſhed from him, it being my opinion,

opinion, that the Holy Spirit is one of the ſeven Spirits, or Angels.

" You produce, Acts xiii. 2. and obſerve that it is probable at leaſt, that the Diſciples at Antioch, prayed particularly to the Holy Spirit; when by his immediate direction, they ſeparated to him, Barnabas and Saul, for the eſpecial work whereunto he had called them. As they faſted and prayed by his direction, in order to give Saul and Barnabas an e pecial commiſſion to preach the Goſpel among the Gentiles, it ſeems reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that they particularly prayed to him, under whoſe ſole direction they then acted." Page 169.

Anſ. If you could have produced any expreſs command in Scripture to pray to the Holy Ghoſt, or any plain examples of this religious practice, it might in that caſe have appeared probable, that the Holy Spirit was the object of the Diſciples praying upon this occaſion. But the Scripture is an abſolute ſtranger to any ſuch language, as praying to the Holy Ghoſt. I challenge you to produce one paſſage, where the duty, or practice, of praying to the Holy Ghoſt, is ſet forth in Scripture: and therefore, when we read of praying without the mention of the object, the Holy Ghoſt cannot, conſiſtently with the Scripture forms of worſhip, be ſuppoſed the object of the prayer. We have his peculiar offices frequently deſcribed; and particularly, that he was the guide and teacher of the Apoſtle's, in the great work of their miniſterial duty. But the ſacred writers have omitted upon all occaſions to inform us, that it is our duty to offer up prayers, praiſe, or glory to the Holy Spirit, which they ought to have done, if it had been required by God and Chriſt. Their

ſilence is one unanſwerable argument againſt your ſcheme; and be aſſured, that the Athanaſian doctrine will as certainly be demoliſhed, as the Scripture is true, in all places where religious liberty and free enquiry are ſuffered to produce their genuine effects.

Rom. ix. 1. My interpretation is this: I ſpeak the truth as a Chriſtian, and herein I have the teſtimony of my own conſcience, enlightened by the Holy Ghoſt. Appeal, 2d edit. p. 103.

On the other ſide you obſerve, that "if the Apoſtle appeals only to his own conſcience, as enlightened by the Holy Spirit, for the truth of what he ſays, he doth no more than what any other perſon might do pretending to the ſame illumination, and the teſtimony of his conſcience ſtill remains with his hearers, as queſtionable as that of any other man, in whoſe power it is to aſſert as much, without any immediate proof of its being ſo, or not: the Apoſtle therefore appeals immediately to the Holy Spirit to teſtify that his conſcience, rightly informed by the Spirit, witneſſeth to the truth of what he is about to deliver; to the end that his hearers, who were fully perſuaded of the Holy Spirit's power to ſearch the heart, might be convinced of the ſincerity of the Apoſtle, by the Holy Spirit's teſtifying in his acquieſcence to the truth of his Appeal." Pages 169, 170.

Anſ. Whether St. Paul appealed to his own conſcience, or to the Holy Spirit, his ſincerity muſt be equally queſtionable to his hearers; it being in the power of any one to appeal to the Holy Spirit, as well as his own conſcience: which appeal in either caſe, could not of itſelf prove his ſincerity. But if you had conſidered my expreſs words, you would have found a clear anſwer to

your

your objection; St. Paul upon this ſolemn occaſion appeals to his own conſcience; and as he knew he was inſpired by the Spirit of God, and could prove the truth of his pretenſions by ſenſible effects, it muſt add great weight to what he was going to deliver, concerning his regard for the Jewiſh people.

As to your objection drawn from this expreſſion, *I ſpeak the truth in Chriſt*, which you take for granted is an appeal to Chriſt in the formality of an aſſertory oath; and therefore, undoubtedly there is the ſame to the Holy Spirit: I anſwer, *I ſpeak the truth in Chriſt*, is not a direct appeal to Chriſt in the form of an aſſertory oath, but ſignifies his peculiar obligation to ſpeak truth as being a Chriſtian; In, or through Chriſt is frequently uſed in this ſenſe: and that *in the Holy Ghoſt*, ſignifies by, or through the Holy Ghoſt, I proved by parallel paſſages, to which you have given no anſwer. The particle *in*, is uſed in variety of ſenſes, and ſometimes even in the ſame ſentence, of which I have produced inſtances above.

What you add, in order to take off from the propriety of a parallel paſſage of the ſame Apoſtle, *I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the elect Angels*, has been anſwered above.

Upon the whole, you are induced to "obſerve the inconſiſtent, and indeed contradictory behaviour of the Appellant in the courſe of the Appeal. He infers that Chriſt is a creature, though he is particularly called God: yet he will not let us infer, that the Holy Spirit is God, though he is no where denied to be God. He will not again allow Chriſt to be God, though on a throne in heaven, and receiving worſhip from the whole univerſe:

univerſe: yet he would prove that the Holy Spirit is not God; becauſe he is not found on a throne, nor receiving divine worſhip." Page 170.

Anſ. It is a ſatisfaction upon a review of the whole affair to find, that I have proceeded upon the principles of reaſon and Scripture. I never denied the title of God to Chriſt, which is indiſputably given him in ſome few paſſages: but we have the expreſs authority of our Lord himſelf, for aſcribing it to him in an inferior ſenſe; and you are obliged to allow a ſort of inferiority to Chriſt, and ſupremacy to the Father: and the Apoſtles have expreſsly declared, that Chriſt is the firſt Being produced, or created by God; from whence you infer that I make Chriſt a creature; if your inference be juſtly drawn, the charge muſt fall upon the Apoſtles, as obſerved above. I have never called Chriſt a creature, becauſe I do not find this very term applied to him in Scripture: and could heartily wiſh that un-ſcriptural terms had been never impoſed upon the conſciences of Chriſtians, in creeds, articles, and forms of worſhip.

As to my not ſuffering you to infer, that the Holy Spirit is God, though he is no where denied to be God; I have faithfully repreſented every title, deſcription, and character of the Holy Spirit; and have declared upon the moſt careful examination, that he is never ſtiled God, or Lord: I have now given a direct anſwer to every thing you have advanced upon this head: after all you conclude with this pretence, that the Holy Spirit is no where denied to be God. The ſacred writers had no ſort of reaſon to deny a thing, that was never aſſerted in their days. Who ever thought of denying the Godhead of St. Paul, or any other perſon,

perſon, who never claimed the character of Gods?

I have proved above, that the worſhip paid to Chriſt is of an inferior nature; and conſequently, the argument drawn from the article of worſhip, to prove him ſupreme God, is effectually overthrown. On the other hand, as no worſhip is directly paid to the Holy Spirit in Scripture, this is an unanſwerable argument to prove, that he cannot poſſibly be ſupreme God.

Upon this you obſerve, that "negative arguments conclude nothing. Yet this is the argument of the Appellant; He that is not on a throne, nor worſhipped, nor prayed to, is not God: the Holy Spirit is not on a throne, prayed to, nor worſhipped: therefore he is not God." Page 171.

Anſ. Negative arguments in ſome caſes, are doubtleſs not concluſive: but I muſt beg you to review this argument, as you yourſelf have ſtated it; for to my underſtanding it is abſolutely unanſwerable; upon ſuppoſition, I mean, that the Scripture be allowed to be the only rule of faith, worſhip, and religious profeſſion. You call yourſelf a ſincere Chriſtian, and conſequently obliged by duty, to adhere cloſely to the faith and worſhip, expreſsly delivered by Chriſt and his Apoſtles. Can you conſiſtently with this character, contend for the worſhip of any perſon, or being, as God, without an expreſs warrant from thoſe holy Perſons, who alone had a commiſſion from God to determine the grand affair of religious worſhip? Can you dare to aſcribe ſupreme divinity to a perſon, who is never repreſented as God in Scripture, never deſcribed as exerciſing any regal authority, and to whom not one act of prayer, praiſe, or glory, is ever aſcribed?

When

When Proteſtants are diſcourſing againſt the corruptions of the church of Rome, they juſtly argue that the Scripture is the only rule of faith and practice; and conſequently, that they ought to reject all doctrines whatſoever, not contained in Scripture: they do not think themſelves obliged to prove, that it denies them in expreſs terms, but that they do not find them in their only rule of faith and practice: becauſe whatever is of divine revelation, muſt be contained in that Scripture, in which alone we have the will of God revealed to us. The very ſame way of arguing, undeniably demonſtrates the force of the argument, as ſtated by yourſelf; for if we are authorized, to reverence a perſon as God, without any command, or example of worſhip paid to him in Scripture, we demoliſh the argument urged againſt the Papiſts, and take a ready method to ſupport the groſſeſt ſuperſtition invented by man. I hope this will prove the occaſion of your ſerious conviction; which will be more conſiſtent with the character of a ſincere Chriſtian, than to perſiſt in the defence of a religious error, when you yourſelf can ſtate an argument that effectually overthrows it.

On the other hand, you ſtate the argument for the divinity of Chriſt in this manner: He that is on a throne, prayed to, and worſhipped, is God: Chriſt is on a throne, prayed to, and worſhiped: therefore Chriſt is God.

Anſ. With regard to this argument, I obſerve, that no Chriſtian denies the Scripture divinity of Chriſt; what you know is denied, is the ſupreme divinity of Chriſt, his being equal to God in all eſſential perfections, and which indeed you yourſelf have in effect denied in the courſe of this debate, when you acknowledge the Father as the fountain,

fountain, and original ſource of the divinity of Chriſt and the Holy Spirit. In your argument there are two fallacies; namely, in the term, *God*, by which you mean ſupreme; whereas the nature of the worſhip paid to him, proves him to be inferior to the one ſupreme God: again, you repreſent Chriſt as on a throne, when he was worſhipped; whereas it is expreſsly ſaid, that he was in the midſt of the throne, when he was worſhipped by ſaints and angels; and the Lord God is deſcribed as ſitting on the throne, in diſtinction from the Lamb in the midſt of the throne, Revel. v. 6, 13.

The true Scripture argument is this: a perſon who is worſhipped, becauſe he was ſlain, and to the glory of God, cannot be ſupreme God: but Chriſt is worſhipped, becauſe he was ſlain, and to the glory of God: therefore he cannot be ſupreme God.

In order to invalidate the force of the argument, with regard to the Holy Spirit, you obſerve, that "if the Father was never repreſented as on a throne, or prayed to, would you conclude from thence, that he is not God? Would no aſſertions of Scripture, ſuch as, that he is God, that he is eternal, *&c.* convince you? Nay, is the Father ever once repreſented in the New Teſtament by name, as ſitting upon a throne?" Page 171.

Anſ. This I muſt freely declare is an incredible ſuppoſition: is it poſſible to imagine, that, when God thought fit to reveal his will to mankind by his only begotten Son, he ſhould leave them in the dark, with regard to the right object of religious worſhip? Was it not one grand end of this revelation, to turn the Gentile world from the worſhip of dumb idols, to the acknowledgment

and

and adoration of the one true God? And does not this end neceſſarily require precepts and examples to ſettle the right object, or objects, of religious worſhip, and in what manner worſhip ſhould be offered? As certain as the Chriſtian revelation was intended to convert the Heathen world from ſuperſtition and idolatry; ſo certain is it, that a clear account of religious worſhip by precept and example, muſt make an eſſential part of this revelation: from whence we may infallibly conclude, that no perſon ought to be acknowledged and worſhiped as a God, whoſe title to this honour is not expreſsly warranted by the ſacred writers. Such an important affair cannot be ſuppoſed to depend upon remote conſequences, and far-fetched deductions.

As to your aſſertion, that the Father himſelf is never once repreſented by name, as ſitting upon a throne, let it for the preſent be admitted as true: but then he is deſcribed in ſuch a manner, that it is impoſſible to miſtake the perſon. The Lord God Almighty who created all things, is the perſon who ſat upon the throne, who is diſtinguiſhed from the Lamb in the moſt ſolemn manner, and conſequently, he can be no other perſon than the father. But upon ſecond thoughts you are not exactly right in your aſſertion: Revel. iii. 21. is an inſtance of it. You quoted this text to prove Chriſt's equality with the Father, which is anſwered above.

But after all, you ſeem to depend upon this expedient: "Though there was not one inſtance of religious worſhip, paid perſonally to the Holy Spirit; his real divinity being otherwiſe clearly evinced; and he being alſo repreſented as the immediate and inſeparable Spirit of God; can it be ſuppoſed

ſuppoſed that you, or any other man, can pray to Almighty God, without praying at the ſame time to his Holy Spirit? Can the ſpirit of a man, though evidently diſtinct from the bodily ſubſtance of that man, be ſeparated even in thought, from the man himſelf? In the ſame manner, neither can the Spirit of God, which is in God, as the ſpirit of man, is in man, though diſtinguiſhed with peculiar properties from the perſons of the Father and Son, evidently comprehended in the ſame Godhead, be ſeperated even in thought from God himſelf. Praying to God then, is directly praying to his Holy Spirit. And this ſeems plainly to be the reaſon why ſo much fewer prayers, or direct acts of religious worſhip, are addreſſed perſonally to the Spirit, than to the Son." Pages 171, 172.

Anſ. Whether you will grant it or not; every unprejudiced Chriſtian muſt grant, that as the New Teſtament was deſigned to point out to Jewiſh and Heathen converts the right object, or objects, of religious worſhip; ſo no worſhip can be thought a duty, without an expreſs warrant from this heavenly book: when you infer the worſhip of a perſon from his ſuppoſed divinity, without an expreſs precept, or example, in Scripture; this ſhould induce you to ſuſpect at leaſt, that you aſcribe divinity to a perſon upon irrational grounds; it being certainly, a point of a very dangerous conſequence, to depart from the appointment of Almighty God, in the article of religious worſhip, on which ſo much ſtreſs is laid in the Old and New Teſtament. If it had been the will of God, that we ſhould worſhip the Holy Spirit in prayer, praiſe, or glory, ſurely it would have been plainly ſet forth.

As

As to your way of arguing, that the worſhip of God, neceſſarily implies the worſhip of the Holy Spirit, he being in God, as the ſpirit of a man, is in man, I have anſwered this above, which is built upon a falſe foundation, namely, that the Holy Spirit is an eſſential part of God, as the ſpirit is an eſſential part of man: whereas the Holy Spirit is a perſon diſtinguiſhed from God, and ſent by him: as it would be very abſurd to ſuppoſe, that man could ſend his ſpirit; ſo it is equally abſurd to imagine, the Holy Spirit ſent by God, if he be an eſſential part of God. And therefore, when we pray to God, we cannot be ſaid to pray to his Holy Spirit, who is conſtantly repreſented in Scripture, as a perſon diſtinct from God, and acting in all things, according to his ſupreme will and pleaſure.

You add, this is the reaſon why ſo much fewer prayers are addreſſed to the Spirit than the Son. Now it appears by a careful examination, that you have not been able to produce even one prayer directed to the Holy Spirit. You find yourſelf obliged to ſpeak diffidently upon the point; neither would you have had recourſe to ſo many far-fetched deductions, and conſequential arguings, if you had been furniſhed with direct and poſitive evidence.

You go on to produce your proofs, for the worſhip of three perſons and one God. Any ſincere Chriſtian would naturally expect, that you would lay before him upon ſuch an important article, ſome plain and clear inſtance, or inſtances of prayers, praiſe, or glory, directed to three perſons and one God, this being the only Chriſtian method to anſwer this plain obſervation; namely, that with reſpect to the religious practice of worſhipping

ſhipping three Perſons and one God, God Almighty hath not appointed himſelf to be worſhipped under this character by precept or example, in any one inſtance in his holy word. See Appeal, 2d edit. p. 104.

The purport of your anſwer is to this effect: "as the Son is repreſented with an human nature as well as divine, his divinity is frequently ſet forth by high titles, attributes and worſhip, leſt the evidence of his divinity ſhould be quite loſt by a conſtant contemplation of his human nature. Whereas the Holy Spirit having no inferior nature to give us a low opinion of him, the Scripture touches but ſparingly the collateral proofs of his divinity, ſo powerfully eſtabliſhed in the expreſs declaration of his being the immediate Spirit of God, that ſearcheth all things, even the deep things of God. And as his being ſtiled the Spirit of God might tempt men to think him the ſame perſon with God, his diſtinct perſonality from the Father is frequently inſiſted on; we cannot account for this different practice of the apoſtles any other way than by believing it was their determined purpoſe to fix the belief of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, three perſons and one God in the minds of chriſtians; to inculcate with the unity of the Godhead, a co-equal and co-eternal Trinity of perſons. Let ſome other account be given of this, and the Appellant ſhall have my leave to ſay, that the ſacred writers have left no example of any ſort of worſhip, directed to three perſons and one God: though now it is as evident to my apprehenſion, that it is ſtrongly expreſſed to the three perſons, and theſe three perſons are as ſtrongly implied to be one God, as that three perſons cannot be one perſon; or that the term, *God*, abſolutely taken,

cannot, ſtrictly and properly, mean one ſingle individual perſon." p. 172, 173.

Anſ. The firſt thought that naturally occurs upon reading this ſolution of what I eſteem an inſuperable difficulty in the Athanaſian trinity, is the undoubted truth of that important obſervation, which has been juſt cited from the Appeal, 2d edit. p. 104. Here is a learned perſon earneſtly contending with all his might for the worſhip of three perſons and one God in diſproof of a plain aſſertion, namely, that it is no where found in Scripture. Has he overthrown this by producing one ſcripture form, ſetting forth the worſhip of three perſons and one God? He has not ſo much as attempted it; not the ſound of a ſingle text appears, wherein this worſhip is either commanded or authoriſed. This in other terms is the confeſſion of an able pleader employing all his ſkill and pains to gain his cauſe, who, when he is called upon to produce his evidence from Scripture, openly declines the trial, and has recourſe to conſequential arguings deduced from premiſes, which have been demonſtrated to be falſe.

You take it for granted, that the ſupreme divinity of Chriſt is frequently inſiſted upon in Scripture; that he has a divine and human nature, namely, the Logos, or word, a ſoul and body: you likewiſe aſſume the ſupreme divinity of the Holy Spirit, as clearly eſtabliſhed in Scripture: now all this has been effectually overthrown in the courſe of the debate; and conſequently, what you infer from the ſuppoſition of the truth of theſe premiſes, falls to the ground. Let it be admitted, that you had proved the ſupreme divinity of Chriſt and the Holy Spirit, the natural concluſion would have been three diſtinct Gods, which is a doctrine ex-

expreſsly condemned by Scripture and reaſon. But let it be admitted, that you had juſtly inferred the doctrine of three perſons and one God, yet ſtill my obſervation holds true, that the worſhip of God under the character of three perſons is not required or authoriſed in Scripture; which muſt convince all unprejudiced chriſtians, that the doctrine of three perſons and one God, is not rightly deduced from Scripture: if it had been a ſcripture doctrine, it would not only have been plainly expreſſed and frequently inculcated, but likewiſe ſome acts of worſhip would moſt certainly have been directed to three perſons and one God; ſo that common chriſtians might as readily have found it upon being told it was in the word of God, as they can now find it in the book of Common prayer.

That the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are three diſtinct perſons, the Scripture plainly declares: but that theſe three are the one God, is ſo far from being expreſsly ſet forth in Scripture, that the direct contrary is, in the moſt ſolemn manner, determined by Chriſt and his apoſtles; the one God being clearly defined to be the Father, as diſtinguiſhed from the Son and Holy Spirit; and the Father being defined to be the only true God, as diſtinguiſhed from Chriſt, ſo that the one God, and the Father, are indifferently uſed to denote the ſame perſon. Again, your cauſe is gone for ever, if God, abſolutely taken, means the Father, as it undoubtedly does in hundreds of paſſages: the groſs abſurdity of your grand principle, that God, abſolutely taken, cannot mean one ſingle individual perſon, has been abundantly demonſtrated. I cannot help obſerving, that you expreſs yourſelf very tenderly, when you are brought to the

pinch of the queſtion: you ſay, account for this reaſonably any other way, and then you ſhall have my leave to affirm, that the ſacred writers have left no example of any ſort of worſhip directed to three perſons and one God. But if you could have produced the leaſt colour, the moſt diſtant intimation of any ſuch worſhip in Scripture, you would have uſed very different language, of which you have afforded ſeveral ſpecimens in the courſe of the debate. I am determined, by God's aſſiſtance, to profeſs this plain and bold truth upon all proper occaſions, without aſking your leave, or the leave of the greateſt mortals upon earth, who have no right to eſtabliſh forms of worſhip, in oppoſition to the ſupreme authority of the GOD of Gods and LORD of Lords.

In the Appeal the celebrated argument of learned men drawn from the article of worſhip, is briefly repreſented in its full ſtrength, and ſuch an anſwer is given to it, as many judicious chriſtians have thought ſatisfactory. It remains to conſider what you have ſaid to invalidate the force of my anſwer, which is built upon the foundation of Scripture. See Appeal, 2d edit. p. 109—111.

To the obſervation, that God's expreſs command to worſhip one God only doth not preclude God from a right to appoint an inferior worſhip to be paid to a perſon in the capacity of a mediator, you anſwer: "If indeed the words of Scripture were, one ſupreme God, you might then bring in as many inferior gods as you pleaſe. But the term ſupreme is no ſcripture word at all." p. 174.

Anſ. As to the term ſupreme, it has been proved above that the ſenſe of it evidently occurs in Scripture: *God of Gods, the Moſt High, the Almighty*

mighty (παντοκρατωρ) neceſſarily convey the notion of ſupreme God. When you argue that we might in this caſe bring in as many inferior objects of worſhip, as we pleaſe, you confound two diſtinct rights, divine and human. Becauſe I have contended for the right of God to appoint an inferior object of worſhip; how does it follow from hence, that men have a right to introduce what objects of worſhip they pleaſe? The whole purport of the Appeal is to ſhew chriſtian people, that no power upon earth has a right to impoſe articles of faith and forms of worſhip, in oppoſition to the authority of God.

You perſiſt in maintaining that "all religious worſhip is appropriated to the one God, and that there is no ſuch thing in Scripture as inferior worſhip. If Chriſt be not truly and eſſentially God, the worſhip paid to him in Scripture cannot be true religious worſhip; but the very ſame kind of worſhip which is addreſſed to the Father by the whole univerſe, Revel. v. 13. is in the very ſame manner, by the very ſame act, in the very ſame words, and at the very ſame time, addreſſed to the Son, in the character indeed of a lamb, of a ſacrifice in his loweſt character. Either then the ſame act of worſhip which is here offered to the Father and Son, is not true religious worſhip; or the Son equally partakes of the divine nature of the Father." p. 158, 159, and 174.

Anſ. You firſt aſſume as a principle, that no worſhip is due to any being but the one God; then you confine the notion of religious worſhip to him only; from whence you infer that the worſhip of Chriſt muſt be ſupreme, and that the worſhip paid to him, proves him to partake of the divine nature of the Father: that is, in other

terms, you beg the queſtion, and then you gain your cauſe. It has been already proved, that the worſhip of a perſon, becauſe he was ſlain and redeemed us to God, which is the very reaſon aſſigned for the worſhip of Chriſt, cannot be of ſo high a nature, as the worſhip of the Lord God Almighty, by whom Chriſt was ſent, and from whoſe favour he received this exalted honour, upon account of his extraordinary merits. The character of a lamb, in which Chriſt is deſcribed, determines the nature of the worſhip, namely, that it is of an inferior kind, and yet it may be juſtly eſteemed true religious worſhip, becauſe God hath appointed it. *Bleſſing, and honour, and glory be unto him that ſitteth upon the throne*, that is, to the Lord God Almighty, for whoſe pleaſure all things were created, *and unto the Lamb*, for his humiliation and ſufferings; ſo that the ſame act of worſhip, which is here offered to the Father and Son upon different accounts, is true religious worſhip, and yet the Son does not equally partake of the divine nature with the Father; for a *lamb ſlain* cannot poſſibly be truly and eſſentially God, that is, God in as high a ſenſe as the Father. Though, therefore, worſhip is appointed to be paid to the perſon of the Son of God, yet he is not, as you aſſert, p. 174. upon an equal footing with the Father, becauſe he is not worſhipped as God ſupreme, but expreſsly as a perſon inferior to God, and to his ultimate glory.

Your next obſervation has been anſwered above.

With reſpect to our Saviour's declaration, *that all men ſhould honour the Son, even as they honour the Father*, which is quoted and explained in the Appeal; you argue thus: "whence is a general likeneſs only, and not a ſtrict equality, collected! why,

why, from the like form of expreſſion in inſtances, where certainly the nature of the things compared, determines the force and extent of the compariſon; and therefore the ſame rule ſhould reaſonably hold in this caſe alſo: but an human father and an human ſon are evidently as to nature equal; and only different in this reſpect, that the one is conſidered as the begetter, the other as begotten: and by analogy of reaſon, a divine Father and a divine Son, ſhould be conſidered in the ſame manner." p. 174.

Anſ. As you allow that in the inſtances produced in the Appeal, the nature of the things compared, determines the force and extent of the compariſon. ſo the ſame rule certainly holds in this caſe alſo. It has been ſhewn above, that we cannot argue from an human father and an human ſon, to God and Chriſt, conſidered under the character of Father and Son. Beſides, it has been diſtinctly proved, that Chriſt is not ſtiled Son of God upon account of deriving the ſame metaphyſical nature from the Father; which ſenſe is not once mentioned in Scripture, though ſeveral other ſenſes of Son of God are diſtinctly ſpecified, and which plainly ſhew him to be a perſon inferior to God: and therefore when our Lord ſays, *that all men ſhould honour the Son, even as they honour the Father*, this muſt be interpreted of a general likeneſs of honour, and not a ſtrict equality, agreeable to the inſtances produced in the Appeal, (2d edit. p. 110.

You obſerve that "the honour in this caſe to be paid to each, it ſhould ſeem, ought to be equal alſo: which the reaſon aſſigned by Chriſt for this honour being given to him, plainly intimates: *the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judg-*

ment to the Son. If then all judgment is committed to the Son, all the conſequent ſame kind of honour, which the Father would otherwiſe have had, is conſigned to the Son alſo. And if he that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father who ſent him, it follows, that he who honoureth the Son, honoureth at the ſame time the Father; and conſequently, the honour paid to the Son muſt be equal to, and of the ſame kind with, the honour paid to the Father; otherwiſe, it would be unworthy of the Father, and therefore could not honour him." p. 175.

Anſ. Your way of arguing upon this point is ſubtle and perplexed, but is eaſily cleared up by the very words of Scripture you quote to eſtabliſh your notion. If the true reaſon of the Son's honour be founded upon the office of judging the world, which he received from the Father; and if men were to honour the Son to the honour of the Father who ſent him, it neceſſarily follows that this honour of the Son cannot poſſibly be equal to that of the ſupreme Father, from whom he has received all right and title to any religious regards: it muſt likewiſe be of a different kind from the honour of the Father, to whom it would be little leſs than blaſphemy to aſcribe honour upon the account of an office committed to him by another perſon. As to your obſervation, that if all judgment is committed to the Son, all the conſequent ſame kind of honour, which the Father would otherwiſe have had, is conſigned to the Son alſo: I anſwer, upon ſuppoſition that the ſupreme Father had thought fit to have judged the world in perſon, we ſhould then have paid him honour as ſupreme and only judge; which muſt be in the nature of things a different honour from what we

are

are obliged to pay to Chriſt, to whom all judgment has been committed by the Father, and to whoſe glory it redounds, and conſequently, it is inferior. To argue that inferior honour muſt not be paid to Chriſt, becauſe it would be unworthy of the Father, is in other terms to contradict the plain ſcripture account which you quote yourſelf, and likewiſe to derogate from the ſupreme authority of the one God and Father of all, as if he had no right to appoint an inferior perſon to be honoured. Your way of arguing is built upon this foundation, that the Father and Son are abſolutely equal in all eſſential perfections, and that they are equally entitled to the ſame honour in all reſpects; which is taking the point in queſtion for granted, in defiance to the very words of our Saviour interpreted by common ſenſe, which clearly determine, that the honour of Chriſt is of an inferior nature, as he receives it upon account of an important office committed to him by the Father.

Inferior religious worſhip implies no contradiction, as I have proved above in oppoſition to your aſſertion. You maintain that "to affirm inferior religious worſhip to be expreſsly commanded by Almighty God, requires not only the cleareſt and moſt authentic evidence, but alſo an expreſs revocation of the firſt commandment, whereby all manner of religious worſhip is plainly appropriated to the divine Being." p. 175, 176.

Anſ. With reſpect to the firſt aſſertion, the cleareſt and moſt authentic evidence has been produced: and if you are reſolved to ſay, that the worſhip of Chriſt upon account of his humiliation and ſufferings, the reaſon expreſsly aſſigned by the inſpired apoſtles, is ſupreme honour and worſhip, and equal to that of the Lord God Almighty, who

ſent

ſent Chriſt into the world, and in conſideration of his perfect obedience, gave him, as matter of favour, this exalted honour: if you cannot ſee an evident diſtinction of worſhip, though demonſtrated even to eye-ſight; you muſt give other perſons liberty to judge for themſelves, and to believe in the ſimplicity of their hearts, that a perſon, who is repreſented as a lamb that was ſlain, cannot poſſibly be equal to the one ſupreme God; nor conſequently, can worſhip paid to Chriſt upon this account, be deemed equal to, and of the ſame kind with, the ſolemn adoration of the Lord God Almighty, for whoſe pleaſure all things were created, and on whoſe grace and favour all the worſhip due to Chriſt, entirely depends.

As to the character of Almighty God, I have ſhewn above, that this is never applied to Chriſt: and with reſpect to his divine and human nature, I have plainly proved, that it is a mere fiction of learned men, without any evidence to ſupport it.

With regard to the repeal of the firſt commandment, you argue thus: "the Scriptures are ſo far from giving the leaſt intimation of any ſort of repeal of that firſt and principal command of worſhipping God alone, that immediately after God's delivering it, he by his ſervant Moſes, according to the Septuagint verſion, Deut xxxii. 43. referred to by St. Paul, Heb. i. 6. introduces the worſhip of the Son by all the hoſt of heaven: and after he had again by the mouth of David, Pſalm. xcvii. 7. intimated the ſame, he yet declares by the prophet Iſaiah xlii. 8.—xlviii. 11, 12. that he will not give his glory to another; that he is the Lord, and none elſe; there is no God beſide him; I am he; I am the firſt, and I am the laſt. The very character which

which Chriſt aſſumes to himſelf in the Revelations; and by which, notwithſtanding, in the prophet, God diſtinguiſhes his incommunicable and ſingular glory: after all Chriſt himſelf inſiſts upon the ſame command, Matth. iv. 10. in its full excluſive force; and in the cloſe of the New Teſtament, the angels to St. John repeat it to the abſolute excluſion of the higheſt creature, or angel.

"Doth this then look like a repeal of even the leaſt tittle of this command? can the leaſt reſerve or exception be thence collected in favour of any other being whatſoever? is there the leaſt implication for an inferior degree of religious worſhip, or a part of that due to God, to be given to an inferior miniſter? There evidently is not. If then it be inſiſted notwithſtanding, that it is expreſsly commanded by Almighty God, contrary to the expreſs declarations of his will, who is it that arraigns the Goſpel account of ſuitable worſhip being paid to Chriſt? you, or the advocates of the eſtabliſhed doctrine? you, who would eſtabliſh an inferior mediatorial worſhip to Chriſt, of which the Scriptures ſay not one word; inſtead of the true religious worſhip, which they actually aſcribe to him equally with the Father: or we, who with the Scriptures deny him your inferior worſhip, and with the ſame Scriptures give him the worſhip due to God? Which therefore being the true ſtate of the difference between us, the papiſts certainly have as good authority for giving inferior worſhip to ſaints and angels, and the Virgin Mary, as you have for giving no more to our Lord and God, our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt." p. 176, 177.

Anſ. As to the firſt commandment, *Thou ſhalt have no other gods but me*, it ſeems at firſt ſight ex-

extremely odd and unaccountable, that there ſhould be ſuch an interpretation exiſting in the chriſtian world, as that *me* ſhould be ſuppoſed to ſignify three perſons abſolutely equal in all perfections. This muſt certainly ſhock Jews and Mahometans, and even Heathens: ſuch an infinite abſurdity was never maintained in the heathen world, amidſt all their polytheiſm and ſtupid idolatry; though they had gods many and lords many, they never arrived at ſuch a pitch of abſurdity, as to believe that three gods could make one God.

But to give a direct anſwer to your argument ariſing from the firſt commandment: if by the firſt commandment it was then meant, that no perſon whatſoever ſhould be worſhipped by the Jews in an inferior ſenſe, there is nothing unreaſonable in the ſuppoſition, that the firſt commandment is ſo far repealed; juſt as the fourth commandment is ſo far repealed as the ſeventh day is concerned, which the Jews were required to keep as their ſabbath. That the New Teſtament ſets forth to us an object to be worſhipped beſide the one ſupreme God, is as plain a matter of fact, as that the one God, and the man Jeſus Chriſt, are two diſtinct perſons, or intelligent beings; or that the Lord God Almighty, and the lamb ſlain, cannot, without the utmoſt confuſion, be thought one and the ſame object.

But I am under no neceſſity to ſuppoſe, that the firſt commandment is in any ſenſe repealed: it may be very rationally underſtood to carry in it a duty of eternal obligation. The true intent of it was to require an acknowledgment of the God of Iſrael as the one ſupreme God, and ſo the only object of ſupreme and ultimate worſhip. The

firſt

firſt commandment was deſigned to eſtabliſh the unity of God in the plain and literal ſenſe, by which the Jews were abſolutely forbidden to own any other perſon as ſupreme God either in oppoſition to, or in conjunction with, him; it likewiſe contains a prohibition of acknowledging any inferior God, without an expreſs warrant from the God of gods. This appears to be the true and preciſe meaning of the firſt commandment: from whence it follows that the firſt commandment in this ſenſe is very conſiſtent with inferior worſhip given to another perſon, when the ſupreme God ſhall require it at our hands. An inferior worſhip paid in obedience to God's expreſs authority and redounding to his glory, may be juſtly ſaid to refer to God as the ſupreme and ultimate object. Now this is exactly the caſe of the worſhip paid to Chriſt according to plain Scripture declarations, without having recourſe to conſequential arguings, and far fetched deductions. *God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jeſus every knee ſhould bow——and that every tongue ſhould confeſs, that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.* Philipp. ii. 9, 10, 11. *When he,* (namely, God the Father) *bringeth in the firſt-begotten into the world, he ſaith, And let all the angels of God worſhip him.* Heb. i. 6. Let it be carefully obſerved, that this command to worſhip Chriſt, was given after his reſurrection and triumphant aſcenſion into heaven, the particulars of which are plainly and ſolemnly ſet forth in the 5th chapter of Revelation. As we are fully authoriſed by the expreſs authority of God to pay inferior worſhip to Chriſt under the character of Mediator, Redeemer, or the Lamb that was ſlain; ſo the worſhip of

of angels is expreſsly forbidden by the ſame authority, and conſequently, the papiſts are condemned who pay inferior worſhip to angels, ſaints, and Virgin Mary, without any warrant from Scripture. Surely Almighty God hath a right to appoint an inferior mediatorial worſhip, though it be the higheſt preſumption in the greateſt mortals upon earth to claim any ſuch right.

Give me leave to obſerve, that the true ſenſe of the firſt commandment ſhould put you upon ſome ſerious reflexions, whether your ſcheme be not a direct breach of this ſolemn law, as you acknowledge two other perſons ſupreme and ultimate objects of religious worſhip, beſide the perſon who delivered this commandment. Three perſons equally ſupreme, whether of the ſame, or different ſubſtances, are three diſtinct Gods, a doctrine expreſsly condemned by the firſt commandment, and, indeed, by every part of the Old and New Teſtament. When God declares by the prophet that *he will not give his glory to another*, it is immediately added, nor *my praiſe to graven images.* I have conſidered this paſſage above, and have plainly ſhewn it conſiſtent with the honour given to Chriſt. With reſpect to theſe ſtrong declarations, *I am the Lord and none elſe*; *there is no God beſide me*; *I am he*; *I am the firſt, and I am the laſt*, (that is, in the higheſt ſenſe; for it has been proved above, that Chriſt is ſtiled in the New Teſtament firſt and laſt in a lower ſenſe:) in the Old Teſtament, I ſay, where God declares himſelf the one ſupreme, and claims to himſelf alone ſupreme and ultimate glory, there are plain declarations that God would ſend a perſon into the world, to whom Jews and Gentiles ſhould be obliged to pay a ſuitable homage. We are taught by the expreſs

command of the Old Teſtament, enforced by Chriſt in the New, *to worſhip the Lord God, and him only to ſerve*; and yet at the ſame time it is plainly and conſiſtently declared, Dan. vii. 14. that *to him* (namely, the Meſſiah) *was given dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all people and nations——ſhould ſerve him.* Let it be always remembered, that the ſupreme God cannot poſſibly have any thing *given* to him by any other being, this being a point ſolemnly determined by St. Paul, Rom. ii. 35. and conſequently, the very honour and glory paid to Chriſt, proves him to be a perſon inferior to the ſupreme Father, from whom he received his right and title to religious worſhip, which undeniably demonſtrates it to be of an inferior nature. When we add to this the plain account of Chriſt's mediatorial worſhip in the New Teſtament eſtabliſhed by the expreſs authority of God, it muſt appear very ſurprizing that you ſhould venture to affirm boldly, there is no ſuch thing as inferior mediatorial worſhip in Scripture, which aſſertion may be confronted with its ſolemn declarations; and likewiſe that you ſhould contend for the worſhip of Chriſt in as high a ſenſe as that of the Father, of which you cannot produce one inſtance.

Be pleaſed to take a ſerious review of this important ſubject, leſt your worſhip ſhould be found a direct breach of the firſt commandment, by acknowledging another ſupreme object of worſhip beſides the perſon who has ſolemnly declared, *Thou ſhalt have no other gods but me:* leſt you oppoſe the authority of God by refuſing to worſhip Chriſt as Mediator to his ultimate glory: and leſt you incur the guilt of unwarrantable preſumption, by putting the inferior worſhip of ſaints, angels,

and Virgin Mary, practiſed by the papiſts, upon the ſame footing with the worſhip of *the Lamb that was ſlain, to the glory of God the Father*, a worſhip expreſsly eſtabliſhed by divine authority.

Having thus examined every material article you have advanced, relating to my ſecond queſtion, the deciſion of it muſt be left to our common readers; whoſe buſineſs it is to bring in the verdict according to evidence, as they have now ſeen the cauſe debated on both ſides: in other terms, let our impartial readers determine, whether that ſummary account of the chriſtian worſhip, as ſet forth in the Appeal (2d edit. p. 111, 112.) at the concluſion of this head, ſtands upon a firm foundation? or, whether your laboured anſwer has effectually overthrown it?

It remains that I examine what you have offered to our chriſtian readers, in order to prejudice them againſt the Appellant.

I thought it my duty to explain to chriſtian people their right and duty upon conviction of the truth of what had been advanced in the Appeal. Accordingly it is plainly ſhewn, that chriſtian people have an undoubted right to make a ſerious and ſolemn proteſt againſt the Athanaſian doctrine and worſhip. This I apprehend naturally ariſes from the caſe, it being an eſſential part of chriſtianity to lay aſide, and even proteſt againſt, all doctrines and religious practices not warranted by Scripture. (See Appeal, 2d edit. p. 115, 116.

Upon this you obſerve that "if this matter is ſo clear as the Appellant pretends, it would be but a poor compliment to the majority, if not to the whole body of the ſpiritual guides and paſtors of the people, to ſuppoſe them ſo void of common

mon ſenſe and common reflexion, as not, equally with the Appellant, to perceive ſo evident a point; and if they did, it would be very uncharitable to think that they ſhould continue in ſo groſs an error." p. 178.

Anſ. There have been many inſtances in the world of large bodies of men continuing from generation to generation in groſs and pernicious errors. Not to inſiſt upon the abominable corruptions of popery, which were ſupported in this country before the reformation took place, and ſtill ſubſiſt in popiſh countries; I will beg leave to ſtate a caſe exactly parallel, with regard to an article of the boaſted church of England.

Let it be ſuppoſed, that I had wrote a plain diſcourſe upon the Scripture doctrine of original ſin; the purport of which was to ſhew, that infants are born into the world perfectly innocent; that they derived no corruption of nature from Adam, but were only liable to death upon his account. Let it be ſuppoſed, that I had endeavoured to prove, that the doctrine of original ſin, as ſtated in the ninth article of our church, according to the literal and grammatical ſenſe of the words and the known meaning of the compilers, is inconſiſtent with God's moral attributes, and the plain declarations of Scripture: that I had appealed to the common ſenſe of all chriſtian people, with regard to this doctrine, which repreſents the compaſſionate Father of all rational creatures, as dooming poor infants to eternal torments, upon account of a corruption of nature derived from Adam.

Upon this you might in like manner have told chriſtian people, that the arguments of the Appellant muſt be ſuppoſed ſome way or other falſe at bottom, becauſe the majority, if not the whole

body of their ſpiritual guides and paſtors, cannot be thought ſo void of common ſenſe as not equally with the Appellant to perceive ſo clear a point; and if they did, it would be uncharitable to think that they ſhould themſelves continue in ſo groſs an error.

The ſame obſervation might be juſtly made upon the doctrine of predeſtination, as ſet forth in the 17th article.

But I ought to acknowledge that I read your next paragraph with particular ſatisfaction, as you make a fair and honourable propoſal, to which I give my hearty aſſent, and hope you are in earneſt. You aſſure chriſtian people, that "if their ſpiritual paſtors have not before thought the Appellant's attempt worthy of their attention, they will now for their ſakes, and for the diſcharge of their own conſciences, give it ſuch an impartial and fair trial, either at the bar of their own ſkill and knowledge, or that of others more able and approved, as that the reſult will be, either an entire concurrence with the Appellant's ſentiments, or a ſufficient ſupply of ſuch convincing arguments in behalf of the eſtabliſhed faith as will enable them to withſtand the force of all his former attacks upon their now plainly abuſed underſtandings." p. 178, 179.

Anſ. It is my ſincere wiſh that this important cauſe may be fairly and impartially examined for the benefit of chriſtian people, and for the honour of Chriſt's religion, as it was left by himſelf and his apoſtles: and in order to promote ſuch an impartial examination, I ſolemnly profeſs my readineſs to give up every argument, and branch of an argument, that cannot be ſolidly defended. Let that part of the controverſy, on which I have laid

laid the greateſt ſtreſs as depending on a plain matter of fact, be cleared up by expreſs declarations of Scripture; and I think myſelf obliged, by a ſerious regard to the day of judgment, fairly and openly to acknowledge myſelf as a perſon, who has endeavoured, through an error of judgment, to miſlead chriſtian people in an important article of faith and practice.

On the other hand, you are certainly obliged, as a ſincere chriſtian, and by your own propoſal, to purſue the ſame honeſt method of openly acknowledging what cannot be defended rationally by Scripture. The reſult of ſuch a chriſtian method equally purſued on both ſides, would be attended with the moſt bleſſed effects, as it would prove an excellent means of getting all religious errors removed from this proteſtant church, which would make it a praiſe in all the earth.

You ſeem to be apprehenſive of terrible miſchiefs to church and ſtate, if chriſtian people were generally to proteſt againſt the Athanaſian forms. Your apprehenſions are groundleſs and imaginary. Mere difference of ſentiments in religious matters and an open profeſſion of them, never occaſion any diſturbance in thoſe places, where religious liberty prevails, where men are left, as they ought to be, to the dictates of their own conſciences, in all ſuch caſes that are not injurious to civil ſociety: it is the reſtraint of liberty, it is the attempting to bring men to uniformity of profeſſions by violent methods that has already done ſo much miſchief in the world, as undeniably appears by the hiſtory of mankind in general, and of the chriſtian church in particular. Such a general proteſt of chriſtian people, as you ſeem apprehenſive of, would produce this good effect; the governors

of the church, and the officiating clergy, would think themſelves obliged to lay aſide the uſe of forms, not warranted by Scripture. Can you, as a ſincere Chriſtian, poſſibly think it the duty of Chriſtian people to profeſs their faith in language, never heard of in the days of the Apoſtles, that never exiſted in the Chriſtian church till many hundred years after their days? And can you, conſiſtently with the character of a Chriſtian, think it their duty to worſhip God as three co-equal Perſons, without the leaſt colour of Scripture evidence to ſupport it, when you yourſelf with all your zeal, have not been able to produce even one inſtance of any ſuch worſhip? This corrupt worſhip did not obtain in the Chriſtian church, till near four hundred years after the times of the Apoſtles, as it is obſerved in the Appeal, which you have not been able to contradict.

I thought it right to exhort Chriſtian people, to make a fair and open profeſſion of their religious principles, with regard to ſuch an important point. You cannot deny the advice to be good, but take occaſion from hence to give ill impreſſions of the author, becauſe his name is not prefixed to the Appeal.

Anſ. As my name was of no conſequence to the public, I did not think it neceſſary: and if I had prefixed my name, you would probably have charged me with inſolence and preſumption. Beſides, my name has no relation to the arguments propoſed; if they are good and ſolid, they ought to be admitted, without any regard to the author's name; if they are weak and trifling, they may be eaſily anſwered. With reſpect to your manner of treating me upon this occaſion, I am diſpoſed to impute it to a warm zeal, for what you eſteem the

cauſe

cauſe of God, which ſometimes carries you beyond the ſtrict bounds of Chriſtian charity: and in return for what you have ſaid, I heartily wiſh you all ſucceſs in your miniſterial office, with regard to thoſe points in which we are agreed.

As to the author of the Appeal, it is ſufficient for Chriſtian people to be acquainted, that he profeſſes himſelf at this time, a miniſter of Chriſt, officiating in the church of England: that he has fairly and openly declared his diſſent from the Athanaſian forms in that very congregation, where he declared his aſſent and conſent, when he took poſſeſſion of the living: that he has profeſſed his reſolution never to ſubſcribe the thirty-nine Articles, nor to declare his aſſent to forms, which he thinks contrary to the word of God. Farther he thinks himſelf under no obligation to reſign his miniſterial office, as he omits no parts of the liturgy, but ſuch as the church had no right to impoſe: that the church itſelf, in which he officiates, is founded upon the right of miniſters and people, to judge and practiſe for themſelves in matters of religion; without which we muſt have lain to this very day in the groſs corruptions of Popery: that he profeſſes a dutiful ſubmiſſion to his ſuperiors in all lawful inſtances, that do not break in upon the duty he owes to the great Shepherd and Biſhop of our Souls. Let this account be compared, with what is ſaid relative to the conduct of clergymen in the Appeal. [2d edit. p. 104—106.]

When you charge the author of the Appeal, with pretending to a readineſs to ſuffer any thing in this glorious cauſe; let it be obſerved, that as he profeſſes himſelf a miniſter of Chriſt, he is very ſenſible of his duty, if he ſhould be called upon to ſuffer any diſtreſs upon account of his religious

principles: but if he has expreſſed himſelf too confidently upon this point, he readily acknowledges it as a fault. The example of St. Peter, Cranmer, one of our firſt reformers, and many others, ſhould teach us to be humble and diffident of our own ſtrength; and ſhould oblige us to be more ſollicitous to approve our ſincerity to God and Chriſt, by ſilent acts of reſignation, and a ſtrong reſolution formed in the heart, than to recommend ourſelves to men, by raſh and confident boaſtings. However, it is proper Chriſtian people ſhould be aſſured, that the author of the Appeal thinks himſelf in earneſt, and humbly hopes, by the aſſiſtance of God, to be able to take up the croſs of Chriſt, if the cauſe of God ſhould require it at his hands.

I never aimed at being a champion, or leader, as you charge me, but thought myſelf obliged to ſet Chriſtian people right in an important point of faith and worſhip, which I apprehend had never been laid ſo plainly before them.

Again, you charge me with adviſing Chriſtian people to join in forms of worſhip, condemned by their own conſciences: whereas my evident deſign, in pointing out the exceptionable parts of the liturgy, appears by my expreſs words to be the direct contrary, to adviſe them not to join in thoſe exceptionable parts. As for inſtance, when the Athanaſian creed is read, they might ſhew their diſſent either by ſitting down, or elſe by ſhutting the prayer book, during the time of reading: ſo likewiſe, when the Litany is read, they might forbear to repeat after the miniſter, the third and fourth petitions. Surely not joining in forms of worſhip, is very conſiſtent with an open proteſting againſt them. I have not inſtructed Chriſtian

people

people to ſhuffle and equivocate with God and their own conſciences, but, on the contrary, to act a fair, ſincere, and Chriſtian part.

I delivered it as my opinion, that Chriſtian people are not obliged to quit the communion of the church of England, if they are tolerated in an open profeſſion of the right opinion concerning God, and his worſhip, as the far greater part of the Liturgy is conſiſtent with it. This advice does not ſhew an inclination to make diſturbances in the church, but has rather a tendency to promote univerſal harmony and peace, notwithſtanding their difference in ſome ſpeculative points, which muſt unavoidably happen, whilſt men are allowed to examine, and judge for themſelves in religious matters.

As for the odious names of Heretics and Schiſmatics, you know very well how ready the Athanaſians have always been to fix them upon thoſe who have dared to profeſs the unitarian doctrine. I delivered it as my judgment, that if any clergymen ſhould not only give theſe odious names, but ſhould go ſo far as to pronounce Chriſtian people unworthy of public worſhip, and ſhould abſolutely refuſe to adminiſter to them the Supper of the Lord, upon an open profeſſion of the unitarian doctrine; that thoſe clergymen are the real Heretics and Schiſmatics, and not the people, as they inſiſt upon terms of Chriſtian communion, that were never required by Chriſt and his Apoſtles. It appears from hence, that the charge of hereſy and ſchiſm is fixed upon thoſe clergymen *only*, who ſhould refuſe the priviledges of church communion to unitarian profeſſors, and not upon all the church, as you would inſinuate; which, though it holds conſiderable errors, cannot be juſtly charged

with hereſy and ſchiſm, whilſt it allows an open toleration for difference of ſentiments in religious matters.

I thought it my duty to inform Chriſtian people, that the Athanaſian creed never appeared in the Chriſtian church, till ſeveral hundred years after the days of the Apoſtles: this information muſt be judged abſolutely neceſſary, as great numbers of people eſteem this creed of equal authority with Scripture itſelf, becauſe it is read in churches with the ſame gravity and ſolemnity, as a chapter out of the Bible. The bulk of mankind have been always apt to take every thing for granted, that is eſtabliſhed by public authority. You have not ventured to deny the truth of this account.

Again, as I had pointed out to Chriſtian people, the exceptionable parts of the Nicene creed, it was very proper to inform them a plain matter of fact, that the expreſſions excepted againſt, did not obtain in any genuine creed, till the year 325, and 381: that the old genuine creeds for the firſt 300 years, contained no ſuch language; and in my ſecond edition of the Appeal, one of the ancient creeds is ſet down, that Chriſtian people might ſee with their own eyes the truth of my account; neither have you been able to contradict this plain matter of fact. What then is your charge? Why, I have not vindicated the inſertion of thoſe paſſages; neither have I declared "that the doctrine of thoſe expreſſions obtained in the church from the beginning, down to the above period; as the learned biſhop Bull hath unanſwerably proved in his excellent defence of that creed." But how could I, conſiſtently with common ſenſe, pretend to vindicate the inſertion of unſcriptural expreſſions, which I was at that very time expreſsly condemning?

ing? How could I, conſiſtently with my ſentiments, tell Chriſtian people that biſhop Bull had unanſwerably proved that the doctrine of theſe expreſſions concerning the Son, was the conſtant doctrine of the church from the beginning, when I was at that very time thoroughly convinced, that the direct contrary had been proved by men, as well ſkilled in the primitive Fathers, as biſhop Bull?

Give me leave to tell you on the other hand that, when you were condemning my conduct without reaſon, you have ſuppreſſed, in your addreſs to Chriſtian people, what they have a right to be acquainted with. Let Chriſtian people be aſſured, that biſhop Bull's celebrated book has been ſhewn to be defective and erroneous, with regard to the main parts contended for, by the learned Dr. Whitby in his * Modeſt diſquiſitions, *&c.* and the defences of it againſt Dr. Waterland; and in general by Mr. Whiſton in his primitive Chriſtianity revived, by Mr. Jackſon, and others. Theſe learned writers have proved, that Chriſt was not believed by the primitive church, to be a perſon of the ſame ſubſtance with the Father; that he was produced, or created by him; that Chriſt is inferior to the Father in every reſpect: they have likewiſe diſtinctly ſhewn from the primitive writers, that the Father was conſtantly ſet forth as the one ſupreme God, expreſsly diſtinguiſhed from the Son and Holy Spirit; which undeniably appears from all the old creeds, and even from the Nicene creed itſelf: ſo that the whole account

* Diſquiſitiones modeſtæ in Clariſſimi Bulli Defenſionem Fidei Nicenæ. Authore Daniele Whitby, D. D. Editio ſecunda. Londini, Impenſis Betteſworth, in Pater-noſter-row, 1720.

relating

relating to this affair, when faithfully repreſented, has a natural tendency to demoliſh the Athanaſian cauſe.

You go on to acquaint our Chriſtian readers, what the Appellant omitted, "that about that time, namely, A. D. 325, and not before, the real divinity of the Son begun to be queſtioned, by one Arius, who thereby cauſing a ſchiſm in the church; to put a ſtop to the further progreſs of this hereſy, a council of above three hundred biſhops of the church aſſembled at Nice, by the authority of Conſtantine, the firſt Chriſtian emperor, from all parts of the Chriſtian world; and upon a ſtrict examination of the ſenſe of the church from the time of Chriſt, condemned the Arian innovations by the clauſes in queſtion of that creed: in which, though the direct words of Scripture are not ſet down, yet the doctrine is plainly and undeniably collected from the clear and obvious ſenſe of Scripture. That the ſingle point enquired into at that time, was the faith of the church concerning the divinity of Chriſt, which they had received from their anceſtors; and that they all, five or ſix, only excepted, gave in the words of the old creed, as it now ſtands, *very God of very God*, &c. with the addition only of the word, *conſubſtantial*, or rather, *co-eſſential*." Pages 181, 182.

Anſ. All perſons acquainted with eccleſiaſtical hiſtory very well know, that there were great diſturbances in the church in the fourth century, occaſioned, not merely by difference of ſentiments, for this is conſiſtent with peace and charity, but by a furious zeal to eſtabliſh articles drawn up in unſcriptural terms, by violence and perſecution. When the unhappy diſpute began between Alexander and Arius, and was grown to a flaming height,

height, the peace of the church might have been ſecured, if the biſhops had agreed to recommend a confeſſion of faith, drawn up in Scripture expreſſions, which the Arians would certainly have ſubmitted to, as undeniably appears from the creeds which they propoſed. Alexander and Arius were both to be blamed for introducing language upon this ſubject, not expreſsly found in the word of God. But it ought to be obſerved in juſtice to Arius, that he never called in queſtion the divinity of Chriſt; ſo that you miſrepreſent the caſe, when you affirm that he called in queſtion the divinity of Chriſt. The divinity of Chriſt was never underſtood, by the catholic writers of the three firſt centuries, in the Athanaſian ſenſe, namely, that Chriſt is God in as high a ſenſe as the Father; or, that he is a ſupreme object of worſhip, or one God with the Father. The whole ſtrain of their writings plainly ſets forth a contrary notion: they aſcribed divinity to Chriſt, becauſe he derived his being from the Father in a peculiar manner, and far different from all other inferior beings; though they acknowledged him to have been produced, or created by God, yet they thought him far ſuperior to all inferior beings, in nature and perfections. They ſometimes ſtile him the begotten God, or God the word. They maintained the unity of God in the ſtrict and literal ſenſe, by referring it, according to Scripture, to the Perſon of the Father, whom they ſtyled the one ſupreme God, and the God of the univerſe. As Arius had made uſe of novel expreſſions concerning the Son, in his debate with Alexander; ſo the council of Nice eſtabliſhed by authority, novel and unſcriptural expreſſions of another kind, namely, *very God of very God, and one ſubſtance with*

with the Father; for *very God of very God*, was not in the old creed, according to your account: in the old creed, as atteſted by the great Euſebius, biſhop of Cæſarea, the words ran thus: *And in the one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the word of God, God of God, Light of Light, Life of Life, the only begotten Son, the Firſt-born of every Creature, begotten of the Father before all Ages.* It appears too, that *not made*, was not in the old creed: whereas you affirm, that the word, *con-ſubſtantial*, was the only addition. The Nicene council was held by the authority of Conſtantine, the firſt Chriſtian emperor, who gave excellent advice to the contending parties; but he himſelf was at laſt over-ruled by a great majority, to eſtabliſh unſcriptural terms by violent methods.

I would obſerve upon this famous council, that two bad things were tranſacted in it, which laid the foundation of infinite miſchiefs in the Chriſtian world: firſt, the introduction of unſcriptural terms into a public confeſſion of faith; ſecondly, the enforcing of them by violence and perſecution. Conſtantine, though an emperor attended with three hundred biſhops, had no more right to impoſe new articles of faith upon the conſciences of Chriſtians, than the meaneſt Chriſtians in the empire. The diſciples of Chriſt conſidered as ſuch, from the higheſt to the loweſt, profeſs one Maſter only in ſpiritual affairs, namely, Chriſt Jeſus; they have no dominion over each other in matters of faith and religious practice. Again, admitting that Conſtantine with his three hundred biſhops had made a righteous and Chriſtian decree; yet they had no right to enforce it by worldly penalties. All force is inconſiſtent with the nature of religion in general, and with the Chriſtian in particular;

particular; it being expreſsly forbidden by our Lord and Maſter, Jeſus Chriſt.

You next obſerve, "that I ſhould have told my Chriſtian readers, that the real divinity of the Holy Spirit was not called in queſtion till ſome time after this; which at length obliged the council of Conſtantinople, to add the clauſes concerning the Holy Spirit, agreeable to the conſtant doctrine of the Chriſtian church, from the times of the Apoſtles to the firſt moving of that queſtion." Page 182.

Anſ. Here you take it for granted, that the divinity, namely, ſupreme divinity of the Holy Spirit, had been the conſtant doctrine of the church from the Apoſtles days, to the time that one Macedonius in the 4th century called it in queſtion: whereas the divinity of the Holy Ghoſt, was not ſo much as thought of for the firſt three hundred years after Chriſt. In the Nicene creed itſelf, *I believe in the Holy Ghoſt*, was all that was profeſſed at that time, agreeably to all the old creeds in the whole Chriſtian world: the Holy Spirit is ſtiled in none of them Lord, or God. The ſame obſervation may be made of the writings of the early Fathers. They are ſo far from aſſerting the divinity of the Holy Spirit, or enquiring in what ſenſe he is one God with the Father and the Son, that they either expreſsly, or by juſt conſequence, ſay the contrary, as it has been diſtinctly ſhewn by the learned writers mentioned above. Macedonius indeed in the 4th century, made uſe of ſome expreſſions concerning the Holy Spirit, not found in Scripture. But his divinity had never been an article of Chriſtian faith, from the days of the Apoſtles to this time. The novel terms of Macedonius on one ſide, proved the occaſion

caſion of novel terms on the other, namely, *Lord of Life, who together with the Father and Son is worſhipped and glorified*; this was an addition made to the Nicene creed by the council of Conſtantinople, and is not warranted by Scripture, or primitive antiquity.

You go on to acquaint our Chriſtian readers, "that the Appellant ought to have told them the whole truth, and not diſingenuouſly to have ſuppreſſed the principal part; thereby to make the eſtabliſhed doctrine of our church to appear, to have been a meer innovation at thoſe times: whereas the Arian and Semi-arian hereſies, were then only firſt broached, in oppoſition to the conſtantly received doctrines of the church, even from the time of our bleſſed Saviour. The hiſtories of thoſe times, which are in the Engliſh tongue, will fully inform them of the truth of what is here aſſerted." Page 182.

Anſ. It plainly appears by what has been already ſaid, that the whole truth relating to this affair, will turn out to the prejudice of that cauſe you are labouring to ſupport. That Chriſtianity was groſly corrupted in the 4th and 5th centuries, and ſo grew worſe and worſe, till Popery was eſtabliſhed, is a well atteſted fact in hiſtory. The plain and rational account delivered in the New Teſtament of Chriſt and the Holy Spirit, was darkened and perplexed by obſcure terms and ſubtle diſtinctions. The grand principle of all true religion, namely, the unity of God, which is a familiar notion adapted to the capacities of all, was confounded in ſuch a manner, that the terms one and three, loſt their uſual ſignification. The great Sir Iſaac Newton has clearly ſhewn, that the very ſame perſons, who were chiefly concerned in making in-

novations in the Chriſtian faith, were likewiſe the inventers and propagaters of a ſuperſtitious regard paid to the reliques of dead ſaints, and the invocation of them in prayer. [See his obſervations upon the prophecies of Daniel, chap. xiv.] As for the peculiar tenets of thoſe called Arians, namely, that *there was a time when the Son was not, and that he was made out of nothing*, it is readily acknowledged that this language is not warranted by Scripture: on the other ſide, you ought to allow that the language of the orthodox, ſo far as it differs from the old creeds, is not warranted by Scripture; and conſequently, neither the one nor the other, ſhould have been inſerted into a public confeſſion of faith. Let it be obſerved, that there was a ſet of Chriſtians at that time, between the Orthodox and Arians, who declared againſt the unſcriptural terms of both parties. The great buſineſs of ſincere Chriſtians, is to profeſs their faith in the language of the holy Apoſtles, without any regard to the party names of Athanaſius, Arius, or Socinus, and to return to the plain ſimplicity of the Goſpel of Chriſt. With reſpect to your terms, *Arian and Semi-arian hereſies*, it ought to be obſerved, that the charge of hereſy has been an uſual artifice in the governing party to blacken their adverſaries, which might with more juſtice be retorted upon themſelves; but it is high time for Chriſtians to lay aſide terms of reproach on all ſides, and to endeavour to ſettle the important points of faith and worſhip, in the ſpirit of peace and charity. I am perſuaded that, if the whole truth relating to this affair, was faithfully laid before every congregation through the whole Chriſtian world, your cauſe would be gone for ever.

In

In the Appeal, the body of the clergy are divided into three parts: ſeveral groaning under the weight of the Athanaſian forms; others of moderate ſentiments; and many blindly zealous in their defence right or wrong. I believe this repreſentation to be ſtrictly true, though you ſeem to take it for granted that it is unjuſt. The unitarian doctrine has been very rationally ſupported by authors profeſſing themſelves miniſters of the church of England ſince the Appeal appeared; namely, the author of the Athanaſian creed re-examined, *&c.* Of the commentary on near two hundred texts of St. John's Goſpel. Of a letter to Dr. Randolph, upon account of his vindication of the Trinity, againſt the Eſſay upon Spirit. Of a ſerious and diſpaſſionate Enquiry, *&c.* occaſioned by the Appeal; to whom Dr. Carter ſhould be added. I make no doubt, but that there are ſeveral other clergymen of the ſame ſentiments, and ſome of very high ſtations in the church. Thoſe clergymen whom I call moderate Athanaſians, you ſtile ſupinely indifferent: but ſurely, men may entertain candid ſentiments of thoſe who differ from themſelves, without a ſupine indifference.

You repreſent me as making the "errors and corruptions of the eſtabliſhed faith, as glaring and manifeſt, as the corruptions and errors of the church of Rome." Page 183.

Anſ. My expreſs words are a direct anſwer to this glaring miſrepreſentation, namely, *It is not pretended that this latter, is as bad as the former*, that is, the worſhip of the Holy Spirit as God, and three Perſons and one God, is not ſo bad as the worſhip of Angels, Saints, and Virgin Mary. See Appeal, 2d edit. p. 123.

You

You go on to obſerve, that "every attack that hath been made upon the eſtabliſhed faith, ſince the firſt revival of the controverſy, hath been fully and completely anſwered, over and over again, with the cleareſt arguments drawn from Scripture and antiquity. And particularly, you recommend Dr. Waterland's ſeveral defences, of his queries upon the point, and eſpecially his eight ſermons." Pages 183, 184.

Anſ. You ſpeak ſo poſitively upon this point, as being accuſtomed to read on one ſide only, that Chriſtian people might naturally judge, that the unitarian cauſe was effectually baffled and confounded; and that the profeſſors of this doctrine had little or nothing to ſay, in anſwer to this celebrated defender of the eſtabliſhed faith: whereas they ought to be informed, that every material article advanced by Dr. Waterland, has been ſolidly anſwered by Dr. Clarke, Mr. Jackſon, Dr. Whitby, and Mr. Whiſton. Beſides the books mentioned above, it is proper to add, Mr. Jackſon's reply to Dr. Waterland's defence of his queries, printed for Knapton, 1722.—Dr. Clarke's obſervations on Dr. Waterland's ſecond defence of his queries, printed for Knapton, 1724.—Mr. Whiſton's letter to the earl of Nottingham, with a reply to his Lordſhip's anſwer—His true origin of the Sabellian and Athanaſian doctrines of the Trinity. The two latter may be had of Mr. Whiſton, bookſeller, at Boyle's-head in Fleet-ſtreet.—— It evidently appears from theſe treatiſes, that Dr. Waterland's uſual pretences, as if the primitive fathers maintained the Athanaſian doctrine, were abſolutely groundleſs. In a word, Scripture, reaſon, and primitive fathers, have been carefully examined, and nicely diſcuſſed by

men of learning and piety; and they all uniformly ſet forth this grand principle of natural and revealed religion, that there is one, and but one, ſupreme intelligent being, or perſon of all poſſible perfection; one ſupreme Lord and Governor of the univerſe; the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, as diſtinguiſhed from all other perſons or beings; and from whoſe will and pleaſure, all beings derive their exiſtence.

The caſe of Dr. Whitby, deſerves to be particularly taken notice of, for the information of Chriſtian people. He was a very learned and pious man, who had eminently diſtinguiſhed himſelf by many valuable writings in divinity, and particularly, a large commentary on the New Teſtament; in which, and ſome other treatiſes, he had laboured to eſtabliſh the Athanaſian doctrine: and yet, in his old age, he thought fit to change his ſentiments upon this important point, after he had impartially examined the cauſe on both ſides; and he thought himſelf obliged in conſcience to acknowledge his former miſtakes, and to profeſs his conviction of the unitarian doctrine openly to the world, which he has done in the moſt humble, pious, and Chriſtian manner. I beg leave to recommend to our Chriſtian readers, Dr. Whitby's laſt thoughts, printed for Knapton, 1728. 2d edit. Let it be obſerved, that though this great and good man lived to the age of eighty-eight years, yet he retained his memory and intellectual abilities to the laſt; ſo that his change of ſentiments was not owing to any failure in his underſtanding, but to an honeſt conviction of mind, founded upon evidence.

In the Appeal, there is an attempt to ſettle in a ſhort compaſs, the point of ſubmiſſion of Chriſtian

tian people to their lawful governors. [See Appeal, 2d edit. p. 125.] One would naturally judge, that a ſincere Chriſtian could have no poſſible objection, to my plain account of this affair, which ſecures an higher regard to the authority of Chriſt, than to that of fallible men; and at the ſame time allows ſuch a ſubmiſſion to human authority, as is conſiſtent with our duty to Chriſt, the head of the church.

You infer from hence, that the "Appellant renders all explanations of the terms and conditions of ſalvation, amidſt an infinity of diſputes, unneceſſary from all miniſters, excepting himſelf, and men of his own ſtamp; and therefore if the paſtors had no right to offer any, namely, explanations, the people were under no obligation to receive them when offered. For when he afterwards ſays, that the governors of the church, are to impoſe nothing upon Chriſtian people, but what they may perceive with their own underſtandings, when properly inſtructed; though he plainly acknowledges a neceſſity of inſtruction, yet he ſeems unwilling to ſuppoſe that it ſhould come from the clergy; as appears from what he preſently adds, that the people have a right to be informed, in a matter plainly tending to create a ſuſpicion of the clergy; to wit, that the authority of councils, convocations, biſhops, and preſbyters, is human; and conſequently, ought to be diſregarded, when it ſtands in competition with the expreſs determination of Chriſt and his Apoſtles: plainly intimating, as if they had, all together, combined to impoſe upon, and miſlead the people in this point, and therefore not to be confided in on any account whatſoever. It is evident then, that he evades the principal matter of the queſtion, (namely, the

eſſential points of duty) anſwering it in that part only which relates to matters of mere indifferency; while with regard to the eſſentials, for the inſtruction of the people, in which points our Saviour appointed peculiar teachers, he ſeems to inſinuate, that others are rather to be depended on; whom, did he dare to ſpeak out, he would not leave you long to gueſs at. But how inconſiſtent again is he here with himſelf, in the beginning of his Appeal, when he perſuades Chriſtian people to think, that they ſtand in need of no other aſſiſtance, but that of their own plain reaſon and common ſenſe." Pages 184, 185.

Anſ. When you infer, that my words imply all neceſſity of inſtruction uſeleſs, unleſs from perſons of my own ſtamp, I heartily pity that temper of mind from whence ſuch want of Chriſtian charity proceeds. Theſe are my expreſs words: It is the duty of Chriſtian people, to eſteem their immediate paſtors very highly for their work's ſake, when they make it their buſineſs to inculcate the plain and fundamental points of Chriſt's religion, and the indiſpenſable neceſſity of an holy life; and above all, when they ſhew them by a conſcientious diſcharge of the miniſterial office, and the engaging force of good example, that they are more ſollicitous for the ſpiritual good of the ſouls committed to their charge, than for their own temporal advantage. [See Appeal, 2d edit. p. 125.] It is my ſincere opinion, that there are great numbers of miniſters, both in the church of England and among our diſſenting brethren, to whom this character may be juſtly applied; and therefore, your charge is abſolutely groundleſs, as if I intended to inſinuate, that none but perſons of my own ſtamp could properly inſtruct the people. With regard

regard to the neceſſity of inſtruction, every reaſonable perſon muſt allow it. Neither is the right of private judgment in matters of religion, for which I have contended, inconſiſtent with the uſefulneſs of teachers. A good teacher may by his ſuperior ſkill, lead Chriſtian people to the right ſenſe of Scripture, and lay the evidence ſo plainly before them, that they may clearly perceive it with their own underſtandings; in which caſe it is as much their own, as if they had diſcovered it by their own endeavours. But when the people embrace implicitly the opinions of their teacher, without ſeeing the evidence on which they are founded; when they receive his ſenſe of Scripture, without an examination, whether it conveys the true mind of the ſacred writers; the teacher is in effect to them the word of God; he is their maſter, and not Chriſt. A ſincere miniſter of Chriſt ſhould not be diſturbed, when Chriſtian people are taught to examine and compare all doctrines delivered by the greateſt authority upon earth, with the written word of God. I cannot help judging that Chriſtian people have a right to be informed, that the authority of councils, convocations, biſhops and preſbyters, is human, and conſequently, ought to be diſregarded, when it ſtands in competition with the expreſs determination of Chriſt and his Apoſtles. Can you deny this conſiſtently with the character of a ſincere Chriſtian? Would you ſet the authority of man above that of Chriſt? Or will you profeſſedly maintain and ſpeak out, that it is the duty of people in all places, to depend implicitly upon the authority of the licenſed guides of their reſpective countries? If this be your meaning, I muſt beg leave to tell you freely, that, though you

profeſs yourſelf a diſciple of Chriſt, you adopt the doctrine of another maſter. If Chriſtian people are obliged to ſubmit to the authority of councils and convocations, though it ſtands in competition with the expreſs determination of Chriſt and his Apoſtles; then it neceſſarily follows, that it is the duty of the people to be Papiſts in France, to be Mahometans in Turkey, and to continue in the practice of the moſt ſtupid idolatry in all thoſe places, where it is eſtabliſhed by public authority: this is the neceſſary conſequence of denying to the people of England, the right of diſregarding the authority of biſhops and preſbyters, when it ſtands in competition with the expreſs determination of Chriſt and his Apoſtles. You dare not openly avow this neceſſary conſequence, as you profeſs yourſelf a ſincere Chriſtian: but you ſeem uneaſy that I have made ſuch a Chriſtian declaration, for you ſay, that this has a plain tendency to create a ſuſpicion of the clergy, and looks as if they had all together combined to impoſe upon and miſlead the people in this point, and therefore not to be confided in on any account whatſoever.

Anſ. But how does it follow that, becauſe the Athanaſian doctrine and worſhip cannot bear the teſt of Scripture interpreted by common ſenſe, therefore the biſhops and clergy are not to be depended upon in any thing? The preſent biſhops and clergy had no hand in ſettling theſe matters; and many of them, I am perſwaded, would be glad to get rid of this corruption of Chriſtianity, if it could be done without any diſturbance. It is obſervable that perſons of the greateſt eminence conſtantly preach up the undiſputed principles of Chriſtianity, without inculcating the Athanaſian doctrine,

trine, or worſhip. With reſpect to our firſt reformers, (for whoſe memory I have expreſſed the higheſt regard upon account of their brave demolition of Popiſh tyranny) it may be obſerved with truth, that they did not examine to the bottom the ſubject of the preſent debate; they too readily took for granted what had been ſettled by councils and the later fathers. Certain it is, that we have as good a right to examine, and compare the decrees of our firſt reformers with the word of God, as they had the decrees of the Pope of Rome; and we are juſtified by their example to proteſt againſt, and reject, all doctrines and religious practices, not warranted by Scripture, which they themſelves have ſolemnly profeſſed to be the only rule of faith and practice. This right is the grand foundation, on which the church of England is built; neither can this be given up, without relapſing into the eſſential principles of Popery, and placing our firſt reformers in the room of the Pope, whoſe enormous power and infallibility they openly and expreſsly diſclaimed, and at the ſame time claimed the ſame to themſelves, upon ſuppoſition that their decrees muſt be ſubmitted to, without conviction founded on evidence. Popery does not ſo much conſiſt in any particular corruptions, as in a power to impoſe decrees in religious matters, which muſt be implicitely obeyed, and not examined, whether they are agreeable to the word of God, or not. I am afraid there is a ſpice of Popery in the greater part of the ſects and parties, into which the Chriſtian church has been unhappily divided.

When the profeſſed teachers of the Goſpel, cannot bear that their doctrines ſhould be examined by that very Goſpel, from whence all juſt autho-

rity in religious matters is derived; this indeed has a plain tendency to create a ſuſpicion in the minds of diſintereſted perſons, that ſuch teachers are more ſollicitous for ſomething elſe, than the pure doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles. The Apoſtles, who had no other intereſt to ſerve but truth and righteouſneſs, were ſo far from being uneaſy, that their preaching ſhould be examined by the propheſies of the old teſtament, to which they appealed in their debates with the Jews, that we find a noble character given of the Bereans, becauſe they ſearched the Scriptures, whether what the Apoſtles had preached, was true or not. Acts xvii. 11.

In order to make the doctrine of abſolute ſubmiſſion palatable to your Chriſtian readers, you tell them, that "in the primitive churches, where the uſe of the original Scriptures was common to all, even then there aroſe various differences of opinion, concerning the ſenſe of ſome of the plaineſt points; and for the ſettlement of which, frequent recourſe was had to the rulers and paſtors aſſembled for that purpoſe. Can it then be ſuppoſed, that the bulk of mankind now, who only can have recourſe to tranſlations (and it is notorious, that the beſt tranſlations cannot always preciſely and exactly convey the ſenſe of the original) are better qualified to perceive, and agree in, the ſenſe of any diſputed point, from thoſe tranſlations, than the primitive Chriſtians were, who had the originals in their hands, and underſtood them as well as we do Engliſh? Who then are to be conſulted and depended on, but thoſe who have made it their buſineſs and ſtudy carefully to examine and compare both?" Pages 185, 186.

Anſ.

Anſ. Certain it is, that men have been apt to entertain different ſentiments of religious matters at all times: even in the days of the Apoſtles, Chriſtians were not of the ſame opinion in every thing. But notwithſtanding this, the main and eſſential points of Chriſtianity were ſo plainly delivered at firſt, and afterwards committed to writing for the benefit of ſucceeding ages, that no real believer in Chriſt can fail to embrace what is abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation. Particularly as to faith, the profeſſion of it was uniform in the Catholic church for the firſt three hundred years: all the creeds during this period conveyed the ſame conſiſtent ſenſe, though the expreſſions are ſomething different. The creed of Irenæus, which is ſet down in the Appeal (2d edit. p. 117—119.) is an evidence of the faith of the whole Catholic church at that time, namely, the ſecond century.

It muſt be owned, that the ſpirit of dominion in eccleſiaſtical matters, appeared even during the period of the firſt three hundred years. The biſhops began to ſettle and determine ſome things with too high an hand: not to take notice of ſeveral decrees relating to the diſcipline of the church, for which they had no certain warrant from Scripture, it may be ſufficient to mention the caſe of Victor, biſhop of Rome, who pronounced a ſentence of excommunication againſt all the churches of Aſia, becauſe they were not willing to obſerve the time of Eaſter, at the ſame time with the church of Rome. This was an early inſtance of eccleſiaſtical power impoſing laws and decrees, without any authority from Chriſt and his Apoſtles. Nothing appears in a ſtronger light through the New Teſtament, than the very little ſtreſs that is laid upon external forms and ceremonies, and the obſervation

obſervation of days: the Apoſtles are upon all occaſions, taking off the minds of Chriſtians from things of ſo ſlight a nature, and fixing them upon the important duties of piety, righteouſneſs, charity, mutual forbearance, temperance and patience. Chriſtians ſhould always remember, that there is but one law-giver appointed by almighty God, namely, Chriſt Jeſus. The determinations of the governors of the church even in the ſecond and third centuries, are not obligatory upon Chriſtians, unleſs they are warranted by the decrees of Chriſt and his Apoſtles. When law-making once began in the church, it never ſtopped till it produced the enormous claims of Popery; which demonſtrates the abſolute neceſſity, of reducing every thing relating to the Chriſtian religion, to the expreſs determination of Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

You infer the neceſſity of common Chriſtians having recourſe to thoſe who are ſkilled in the learned languages, becauſe tranſlations do not always preciſely convey the ſenſe of the original. It has been already obſerved, that our tranſlation is upon the whole to be depended upon, and that it conveys the true ſenſe of the original in all important points: and where the tranſlation is faulty, and when any text, or texts, are of doubtful authority in the original, is it not the duty of the learned, to inform Chriſtian people of the very right of the caſe? For where is the uſe of their applying to the learned, which you ſay they ought to do, if the learned do not fairly and honeſtly acquaint them with the very truth? I thought it my duty to give Chriſtian people the beſt information I was capable of, upon that important point I addreſſed an Appeal to their common ſenſe: and yet you inconſiſtently blame my conduct, becauſe

I have

I have fairly ſet forth ſome things you wanted to conceal. In other terms, the people ought not to be ſet right, if it breaks in upon points ſettled and determined by public authority. I cannot help judging, that Chriſtian people have a right to be informed in all caſes, wherein their faith and practice are immediately concerned.

With reſpect to your next paragraph, regarding my Appeal to the learned, it has been ſufficiently conſidered in my anſwer to your preface.

You go on to acquaint your Chriſtian readers, "that they ſtand in need of the beſt helps: and what better can they have, than thoſe whom Chriſt hath appointed to work for their ſalvation, and to guide them into all ſaving truth, under the penalty of eternal miſery, if they wilfully, or through neglect, miſguide or deceive them. And in order to enable the people to diſtinguiſh who thoſe pious men are, you refer them to a plain rule delivered by St. John; 1 John iv. 1, 2, 3. *Beloved, believe not every ſpirit; but try the ſpirits, whether they are of God —— hereby know ye the ſpirit of God: every ſpirit that confeſſeth not that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the fleſh, is not of God.* But to confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the fleſh, is in other words to confeſs the whole Goſpel of this ſame Apoſtle; wherein he clearly teaches that the perſon whom he here means by Jeſus Chriſt, In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God (the Father), and was God (the Son); that he, jointly with the Father, created all things; is (always) in the boſom of the Father, his only begotten Son, and one with the Father; that he was made fleſh; that is, took perfect human nature upon him; and conſequently, acted and ſuffered, conſiſtently with the one, or other, of theſe two natures, as the occaſion,

ſion, or circumſtances of our redemption required. They then, who confeſs and teach the ſame doctrine which St. John taught, are thoſe whom the people ſhould believe." Pages 186, 187.

Anſ. That Chriſtian people want the beſt helps, I never denied; and have endeavoured to expreſs myſelf with all proper regard for miniſters of all denominations, who make it their buſineſs to inſtruct the people committed to their charge in the main and eſſential points of Chriſtianity. I believe it may be affirmed with truth, that the general preaching of Proteſtant miniſters, is chiefly employed in inculcating the grand things, in which all Chriſtians are uniformly agreed.

It is obſervable, that though you have thought fit to condemn me for appealing to the common ſenſe of all Chriſtian people; yet you are obliged to make the ſame Appeal yourſelf, by the expreſs authority of St. John. For if Chriſtians are required, *not to believe every ſpirit, but try the ſpirits whether they are of God*; is not this an exhortation to Chriſtians, to exerciſe their judgment in religious matters, leſt they ſhould be impoſed upon by ſpecious pretences? Does not this neceſſarily imply, that it is their right and duty to examine all doctrines by the word of God, and to regulate their faith and practice by what they can perceive, with their own underſtandings, is agreeable to the revealed will of the Almighty? You ſhould at leaſt have commended my method, though you differed from me in ſentiments. In the name of God, let the cauſe be tryed by the authority of St. John. He aſſures us, *that every ſpirit that confeſſeth that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the fleſh, is of God. And every ſpirit that confeſſeth not that Jeſus Chriſt is come in the fleſh, is not of God.* 1 John iv. 2, 3.

To

To which let the 15th verſe of the ſame chapter be added, and the 1ſt verſe of the following chapter; *whoſoever ſhall confeſs that Jeſus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God. Whoſoever believeth that Jeſus is the Chriſt, is born of God.* This is the very doctrine I have laboured to eſtabliſh, and therefore our Chriſtian readers cannot condemn me as a falſe miniſter, when I contend for the plain doctrine of St. John himſelf.

But in order to explain the doctrine of St. John, you quote the 1ſt, 3d, and 18th verſes, of the firſt chapter of his Goſpel, and the 30th verſe of the 10th chapter. It has been already proved, that the title of God is given to Chriſt in an inferior ſenſe. With reſpect to the work of creation aſcribed to Chriſt, the form of the expreſſion neceſſarily imports, as I have ſhewn above, that he acted under God the ſupreme creator. I would juſt obſerve, that, when you profeſs to quote Scripture, you ſhould not put your own comment in the room of it; the text ſays, *that all things were made by, or through him.* Again, *the only begotten Son, which is in the boſom of the Father, he hath declared him*, may be juſtly rendered, *which was in the boſom of the Father*, that is, was admitted into the councils and deſigns of God relating to the ſalvation of man, as I have obſerved above: the word, *always*, is not in the text. In what ſenſe Chriſt is the only begotten Son of the Father, has been diſtinctly explained; and likewiſe in what ſenſe he was one with the Father. Your notion too of Chriſt's human and divine nature, has been effectually overthrown. I give my hearty aſſent to your exhortation, when you tell your Chriſtian readers, that thoſe who teach the ſame doctrine which St. John taught, are to be believed. I am well

well aſſured, that St. John never taught the Athanaſian doctrine. It may be obſerved of St. John's Goſpel, that it furniſhes more, plainer, and ſtronger arguments, if poſſible, againſt the Athanaſian doctrine, than any other ſingle portion of Holy Scripture. The few expreſſions you have quoted, are very conſiſtent, when rationally interpreted, with the numerous and plain declarations of our Lord himſelf; wherein he has in the moſt ſolemn manner, profeſſed himſelf a perſon *ſent* from God, *given* by God, *taught* by God, or his Father, *ſanctified* by the Father, *commanded* by God: he has likewiſe declared, that he came down from heaven, *not to do his own will, but the will of the Father which ſent him*; *that of himſelf he can do nothing*; *that the Father is the only true God*, as diſtinguiſhed from Chriſt; that he aſcended to *his God and Father*. All which, and many other declarations in St. John's Goſpel, demonſtrate to common ſenſe the falſhood of the Athanaſian doctrine. With reſpect to thoſe expreſſions you have quoted from St. John's Goſpel, any unprejudiced Chriſtian might naturally aſk, What is become of three Perſons and one God? How can this doctrine be extracted from theſe expreſſions of St. John, which convey no ſuch notion either in ſenſe, or in ſound? The profeſſed deſign of your anſwer is to ſhew, that this was the doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles; but you perpetually fail, when you are brought to the pinch of the queſtion. Again, it may be naturally aſked, how does it appear from any part of St. John's writings, that it is the duty of miniſters of Chriſt, to ſubſcribe an hundred and fifty-eight propoſitions, of which the thirty-nine articles conſiſt? The plain, literal, and grammatical ſenſe of many of theſe propoſitions is ab-

ſolutely falſe, if we take Scripture for our guide, and many others of them have little or no relation to the fundamental points of Chriſt's religion. In words you profeſs the doctrine of St. John; but when your ſenſe is aſcertained, you mean the doctrine of party writers, who lived ſeveral hundred years after the days of the Apoſtles. I am afraid your real view is, to exclude thoſe perſons from the miniſterial office, who cannot digeſt all the propoſitions in the thirty-nine articles, upon account of a ſtrict adherence to the doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

You exceed the bounds of Chriſtian charity, when you inſinuate that the Appellant cannot bear the teſt of our Saviour's rule, *ye ſhall know them by their fruits*; that is, by their lives and actions. You profeſs not to know his life and actions, and therefore you have no right to condemn him. The Appellant has expoſed himſelf to much odium upon account of his open profeſſion of the unitarian doctrine, and has acted in direct oppoſition to worldly views: he profeſſes himſelf a ſincere lover of Chriſtian morals, and believes in earneſt that the habit of one vice is deſtructive of ſalvation; and therefore, the Appellant muſt be a perſon of a ſtrange compoſition, if he lives in the practice of any vice condemned by the Goſpel, and thereby forfeits his intereſt in both worlds. When you tell your Chriſtian readers, that the Appellant ſhould ſhew his readineſs to ſeal his doctrine with his blood, as the Apoſtles and primitive Chriſtians did, he has reaſon to bleſs God, that he lives under the mild, juſt, and gracious government, of the illuſtrious Family now upon the throne, who have always reſtrained the furious ſpirit of hell-born perſecution, and will not ſuffer the beaſt to rage.

He

He thinks himſelf happy that he does not live in France, Spain, or Italy. But it is impoſſible in this land of liberty to ſhew any ſuch readineſs; and it does not become an humble Chriſtian to talk of laying down his life, when he is not likely to be called to ſo ſevere a trial. All Chriſtians, indeed, ſhould endeavour to be habitually prepared in the temper of their minds, for the greateſt trials: but none can be judges of their ſincerity, but God and Chriſt, who know the hearts of men.

You charge me with delivering *new doctrines:* in this you forget what you had ſaid a little before, when you told your Chriſtian readers, that my book contained, *only ſtale* (old) *objections dreſſed up in a popular garb.* Pages 183, 187. In truth, the doctrine delivered in the Appeal, is juſt as old as the Bible itſelf, it being the grand principle that runs through the Old and New Teſtament, from the beginning to the end.

You charge me with having "repreſented the ſtate of the Chriſtian church, in and after the time of Conſtantine, that any one might imagine, that the Arian tenets were the true articles of faith, and thoſe of the defenders of the Nicene creed, the only innovations: that Athanaſius and his adherents were tyrants and perſecutors, and that Arius and his followers were the perſecuted ſufferers. When it is notorious, that the Arians were the perſecutors, and the Orthodox, when they had the power, only exerciſed ſome neceſſary cenſures tempered with mildneſs and charity." Pages 188.

Anſ. Let any unprejudiced perſon read what I have ſaid, and it will appear that I have not ſaid one ſyllable of thoſe times but what is ſtrictly true. My account virtually condemns the peculiar additions of both parties. I have expreſsly condemned

demned the perſecutions of the Orthodox and Arians, it being a notorious matter of fact, that they were both perſecutors: only you will not allow that the Orthodox perſecuted the Arians. When poor heretics are baniſhed, impriſoned, reduced to beggary, or even put to death, theſe things muſt be eſteemed only neceſſary cenſures. When I wrote, I really thought in the ſimplicity of my heart, that ſuch terrible evils were inſtances of perſecution, whether inflicted by the Orthodox, or the Arians. But, it ſeems, a diſtinction muſt be made of which I was not aware: when the orthodox diſtreſs heretics with the moſt terrible evils, in the ſpirit of charity for the good of their ſouls, the greateſt puniſhments in ſuch caſes, muſt be deemed neceſſary cenſures: but if the Orthodox ſuffer the very ſame evils from heretics, this is perſecution. It really grieves one to obſerve the prejudices and partiality of mankind, when they are attached to favourite tenets; for the ſupport of which, they will not only give up the common principles of reaſon, but will likewiſe palliate, excuſe, if not commend, thoſe very practices, of which they would loudly complain, if they themſelves were the ſufferers. A blind religious zeal carries poor mortals beyond the bounds of common ſenſe, and hardens them againſt the common feelings of human nature.

In the next paragraph, the enormous power of the church of Rome is attributed to the miſchiefs occaſioned by the Arian hereſy. But, I think, I have given in the Appeal a more rational account of this grand apoſtacy, which certainly owed its birth and completion, to that impious principle, that it is the duty of church governors, and the civil magiſtrate, to enforce religious doctrines by

violent methods. The firſt inſtance of this unchriſtian practice, was the baniſhment of Arius and his adherents, by the authority of the Nicene fathers ſupported by Conſtantine, becauſe they would not ſubſcribe the novel terms inſerted in the Nicene creed. From this time the ſtate of the church grew worſe and worſe, till at laſt Popery was eſtabliſhed. If, as it is obſerved in the Appeal, the contending parties had been confined to the uſe of ſpiritual weapons, the moſt terrible evils might have been prevented, and the peace of Chriſtian communities might have been ſecured upon a laſting foundation.

Again, you obſerve, that the ſudden riſe of Mahometiſm in the Eaſt, was owing to the prevalence of Arianiſm in that part of the world. But, I believe, if we examine this affair with more attention and impartiality, we ſhall find that the Mahometan religion did not prevail, without an extraordinary permiſſion from God; and that it was deſigned to puniſh the Chriſtian world for their groſs corruptions in doctrines and practice, and for the violent methods by which they were eſtabliſhed. The unity of God, the grand principle of all true religion, was corrupted in the viſible church of Chriſt; a ſuperſtitious veneration of reliques, and invocation of ſaints, immediately followed this corruption, which was introduced by lying wonders. It does not become us to be too curious about the ways of providence: but certain it is, that the Mahometan religion is a much better ſtate of things, than that ſtupid idolatry which prevailed in Arabia before Mahomet's time: this religion may prove a happy circumſtance, in paving the way to the converſion of thoſe extenſive countries to the Chriſtian faith, when the Athana-

ſian

ſian Trinity ſhall be removed from the churches of Chriſt. This groſs corruption of the Chriſtian religion, as I preſume to call it upon the moſt ſincere and impartial review, is one grand obſtacle to the converſion of Mahometans and Jews.

We are both agreed in ſpeaking honourably of the Revolution, and the illuſtrious family ſettled upon the throne: only you ſeem to think, that Chriſtian liberty was as well un erſtood before the Revolution, as it has been ſince. But in this I differ, becauſe it is certain, that Chriſtian liberty was not uniformly practiſed before that happy period. Cranmer himſelf, one of our firſt reformers, and a very excellent perſon in other reſpects, got ſome perſons burned for reputed hereſy. There were many ſevere and cruel proceedings in the reigns of queen Elizabeth, James's, Charles's, againſt diſſenters and reputed heretics. On the other hand, the diſſenters themſelves, when they had got power in their hands, during the troubleſome times, and Oliver's uſurpation, exerciſed great ſeverities againſt churchmen and heretics. The duty of Chriſtian toleration was not practiſed by the governing party. It is high time that the ſpirit of perſecution ſhould be baniſhed from all Chriſtian countries, and that mutual forbearance, love and charity, ſhould prevail amidſt our greateſt differences in religious matters.

Your notion of chriſtian liberty ſeems to be, the ſecurity the Athanaſian doctrine has received from acts of parliament both before and ſince the revolution; and you call my Appeal and other treatiſes of the ſame kind, attacks upon chriſtian liberty. p. 189.

Anſ. When diſputants cannot agree about the preciſe meaning of words, it is neceſſary they

ſhould be explained. My notion of religious liberty is this: all rational creatures have a right to judge for themſelves in religious matters, and likewiſe to profeſs their ſentiments and practiſe accordingly, without any reſtraint from the greateſt power upon earth. Civil governors have no right to injure, diſtreſs, or inflict penalties upon any perſons, becauſe they contradict human laws, with regard to opinions or practices merely religious. In this ſenſe I have earneſtly contended for chriſtian liberty. But I am afraid you ſhew a diſpoſition to tranſgreſs the bounds of chriſtian liberty, when you expreſs your inclination, "that the gracious and royal defender of the eſtabliſhed faith would not ſuffer it to be diſturbed by old objections, already ſo ſtrongly and clearly refuted, when theſe very points were ſome years ago diſcuſſed by the ableſt men of both ſides of the queſtion; in order, doubtleſs, that thereby the fulleſt light may be thrown on the prevailing ſide. The event hath eminently favoured the preſent eſtabliſhed faith." p. 189, 190.

Anſ. In your title page you call yourſelf a ſincere chriſtian; and in your addreſs to your chriſtian readers you aſſure them, that the Appellant's arguments ſhall be carefully examined for their inſtruction and information: and yet notwithſtanding theſe profeſſions, you ſeem to depend chiefly upon the civil magiſtrate for the ſupport of your cauſe, and ſhew too plain a diſpoſition to get unitarian profeſſors puniſhed with fines and impriſonments, according to act of parliament; a method of conviction, about which the Goſpel is ſilent, wherein the amiable method of reaſon and argument, attended with peace and charity, is conſtantly recommended. You betray the weakneſs

of

of your cauſe, when you call in the aid of external force and worldly intereſt; by which the vileſt ſuperſtition, the moſt abſurd doctrines, and impious idolatry, have been ſupported in almoſt all ages and countries; and by which right notions of the one ſupreme God have been kept from the underſtandings of the generality of men; ſo that they have not had a fair opportunity of knowing the Almighty Creator, in whom (or, through whom) we live, move, and have our being. Dreadful and aſtoniſhing! eſpecially if it be conſidered, that the God of nature ſhines ſo ſtrongly before our eyes, that even children are capable of forming rational ſentiments of this glorious Being, when properly inſtructed, and the evidence is fairly laid before them. But be aſſured, that our gracious ſovereign who is the father of his people, and has a very tender regard for their civil and religious liberties, will never be prevailed upon by perſecuting bigots to employ the ſecular arm to ſuppreſs the exerciſe of the ſacred rights of conſcience.

It is readily granted that the ſubject of the preſent debate was diſcuſſed on both ſides ſome years ago by able and learned men: from whence you argue that the eſtabliſhed faith muſt be right, becauſe the Athanaſian forms are ſtill kept up, notwithſtanding thoſe debates. The very ſame argument directly proves, that the plain and literal ſenſe of the 9th, 13th and 17th articles, according to the known intent of the compilers, is true doctrine, though it be an undoubted fact, that the original ſenſe of theſe articles has been given up long ago by all rational divines. Dr. Barrow and many other proteſtant writers, have proved with demonſtrative evidence, that the ſupremacy of the

pope of Rome is an abſurd and impious pretenſe; and yet notwithſtanding the force of the ſtrongeſt arguments, the ſupremacy of the pope of Rome ſtill continues: from whence you might argue, that it is certainly right and well founded; *the event hath eminently and conſpicuouſly favoured the eſtabliſhed ſupremacy of the pope of Rome.*

I fully agree with you, that we enjoy *extraordinary bleſſings* under the preſent government; and I am afraid we have not made *ſuitable returns*, by a ſtrict regard to the laws of Chriſt's religion. There are at this time great complaints of infidelity, ſcepticiſm, irreligion, vice and wickedneſs, as if they abounded more, and were arrived to an higher pitch than in former ages. If this be a true repreſentation of the times, the cauſes of ſuch great and ſpreading evils ſhould be narrowly examined, and proper remedies applied. It is to be feared, that the clergy, as well as laity, have contributed their part to theſe growing corruptions. When the profeſſed preachers of Chriſt's religion ſeem determined to ſupport doctrines and religious practices, without any warrant from Scripture, and for which they can ſcarce plead with even plauſible colours; this has a natural tendency to prejudice many perſons viciouſly inclined againſt the Goſpel itſelf, as if the whole had no better foundation than thoſe corrupt errors, which are retained, though known to be ſuch. But I refer to an honeſt and chriſtian pamphlet, entitled, Serious and Free Thoughts on the preſent State of the Church, &c. addreſſed to a Biſhop. Printed for Waugh and Fenner, at the Turk's Head, Lombard-ſtreet, 1755, where this point is judiciouſly conſidered. I am under terrible apprehenſions, that the ſtate of religion in the church of England,

land, will grow worſe and worſe, if the governors of it employ no endeavours to begin and accompliſh a more perfect reformation, by reducing our creeds, articles and forms of worſhip to the ſtandard of Scripture, on which foundation the church was built, and on which alone it can ſtand ſecure.

I thought it my duty, after having explained the nature of chriſtian liberty, to conclude with an earneſt exhortation to the practice of all chriſtian virtues, in order to prevent any poſſible miſconſtruction, as if I had meant to amuſe common chriſtians with mere ſpeculations, without any regard to chriſtian morals, which, I believe, is the grand end and deſign of the Goſpel of Chriſt: my view likewiſe was to guard againſt any notions of liberty tending to licentiouſneſs, in imitation of the glorious example of St. Paul. But, it ſeems, my exhortations loſe their weight, becauſe *the infinite value of the ſacrifice offered by a divine Redeemer* is omitted. Let it be obſerved, that our Lord's own divine ſermon on the Mount, and the very language of the holy apoſtles, make a part of my exhortations; whoſe authority I eſteem of greater weight, than that of all the creed makers, and ſyſtem inventers, and ſupporters, in ancient or modern times.

You refer to the theological opinion, that God's infinite juſtice requires an infinite ſatisfaction; which infinite ſatisfaction "muſt greatly enhance the heinouſneſs of our ſins, which, we find, could not be atoned for at a leſs price. But when we are told that the value of our ranſom is infinitely over-rated, the ſenſe of the enormity of our ſins muſt be proportionably leſſened; and therefore the value of the motive, upon which the Appellant re-

commends the practice of true chriſtian piety, is greatly leſſened." p. 190.

Anſ. The misfortune is, the notion of the neceſſity of God's infinite juſtice demanding an infinite ſatisfaction, when man had diſobeyed the laws of his Maker, has no foundation in Scripture, and is inconſiſtent with the principles of reaſon. As to reaſon, let this familiar inſtance be ſufficient. Let it be ſuppoſed, that I owe a creditor a ſum of money, which I am not able to diſcharge; the creditor inſiſts upon full and exact payment, and thinks himſelf obliged to execute the ſeverity of the law, unleſs he receives his full demand: I have a generous friend, who pays the creditor his full demand: the queſtion is, to whom I am obliged? the anſwer is plain, my generous friend is the perſon, to whom I am under obligations for his diſintereſted kindneſs. The creditor, who would remit nothing, and is fully diſcharged, can appear to me in no other light than a perſon, who is ſtrictly rigorous in his demands, but ſhews no mercy or compaſſion in the caſe; neither are there any acknowledgments due to him upon this account. In like manner, God Almighty is ſuppoſed to be a Being of infinite juſtice; his creature man has by wilful ſinning contracted a debt, which he is unable to diſcharge, as neceſſarily requiring an infinite ſatisfaction: Chriſt, a perſon of an infinite nature, undertakes the buſineſs, and fully diſcharges the debt for all ſinners; and conſequently, ſinners are more obliged to Chriſt than to God the Father. Again, this account repreſents Chriſt as a perſon of greater goodneſs than the one God and Father of all, who, as creditor, is fully paid, and Chriſt, our generous friend, has freely diſcharged the debt to the utmoſt farthing. But this

this doctrine is expreſsly contrary to the whole ſtrain of the ſacred writings, which deſcribe the ſupreme Father as a Being of mercy and goodneſs as well as juſtice; and, particularly, our Lord himſelf has repreſented him as good beyond all compariſon. The New Teſtament conſtantly ſets forth the love of God as the grand ſource, from whence our redemption by Chriſt is derived: the whole affair is entirely owing to the free grace and favour of the one ſupreme God and Father of all, who graciouſly thought fit to appoint the mediation of Chriſt as the means, whereby we enjoy the glorious privileges of the Goſpel-covenant. There is nothing ſaid in the word of God about God's infinite juſtice requiring an infinite ſatisfaction, which abſolutely deſtroys the moral character of our heavenly Father. If God's juſtice be of ſuch a nature as to require an adequate payment, what is become of his mercy and goodneſs? there can be no room for the exerciſe of theſe amiable perfections, which are the greateſt glory of God himſelf. Beſides, if Chriſt has fully paid the debt of all wilful ſinners, there is little left for the ſinners themſelves to do: has not this notion a direct tendency to take off the minds of chriſtians from a proper attention to ſtrict piety and virtue, and to induce them to rely entirely on the merits of their Saviour, without having any merit of their own? and has not this doctrine actually produced this bad effect in numbers of chriſtian people?

On the other hand, what has been ſaid in the Appeal to leſſen the true nature of wilful ſin? my exhortations neceſſarily imply and directly ſet forth, that wilful ſin under the light of the Goſpel, is attended with heinous aggravations, as it is committed againſt the expreſs authority of God revealed

vealed to us by Chriſt. I have expreſſed myſelf very ſtrongly againſt all wickedneſs in general, and againſt every vice in particular, as being inconſiſtent with the character of a chriſtian. The charge of leſſening the motive upon which my exhortations are founded, muſt fall upon the ſacred writers, who have not ſaid one word about a ſacrifice of an *infinite* value.

I would add, that the value of Chriſt's ſacrifice does not depend upon the opinions of men, but upon the expreſs will of the Almighty. As I have plainly ſhewn from Scripture, that Chriſt is a perſon inferior to the one ſupreme God, but exalted above all other beings, I have not leſſened the value of our ranſom, but have repreſented it according to its real and intrinſic worth, ſettled by God himſelf. But it is obſervable, that your ſcheme, when ſtrictly examined, does not convey ſo high a notion of Chriſt's ſacrifice, as that of the Euſebian * unitarians: you repreſent Chriſt conſidered in his higheſt capacity as ſuffering nothing; it was his human nature, a mere man, according to your account, that really performed the work of our redemption: whereas the Euſebian unitarians, who aſcribe the ſufferings and humiliation to the perſon of Chriſt, through whom God created all things, entertain a grander notion of the value of the ſacrifice offered by our Redeemer, than the reputed orthodox who ſay, that the man only ſuffered, whilſt the divine nature continued incapable of any ſort of ſufferings. It was an amazing inſtance of humiliation, that ſo

* As contradiſtinguiſhed from thoſe unitarians, who deny the pre-exiſtence of Chriſt before his miraculous birth of the Virgin Mary.

glo-

glorious a being as the firſt-born of every creature, ſhould condeſcend ſo far as to take our nature upon him, and to lay down his life for ſinful mortals.

With reſpect to the puniſhments threatened in the New Teſtament, I have expreſsly declared, that all wilful ſinners, whilſt they continue ſuch, are cut off from all hopes of the happineſs of heaven, and conſequently are liable to thoſe dreadful and amazing torments, ſo plainly threatened in the Goſpel of Chriſt.

It is owned, that many learned and pious men have given up the abſolute eternity of hell torments: but I know none who have maintained, that "angels of light are ſtill in danger of becoming angels of darkneſs, and that angels of darkneſs have a fair chance of becoming angels of light," as you repreſent it. Again, you ſhew too plain an inclination to miſrepreſent perſons who differ from you, when you obſerve "that the lure of a temporary hell has been thrown out to catch at proſelytes amongſt the vileſt of mankind." p. 191.

Anſ. On the other hand, I am perſuaded, that the true motives of thoſe learned writers in giving up the abſolute eternity of hell torments, were drawn from a ſtrict regard to the moral character of our heavenly Father, and the honour of Chriſt's religion; becauſe they thought this doctrine inconſiſtent with the juſtice, mercy, and goodneſs of God, which continue for ever; and likewiſe becauſe they believed, that a co-eternity of the torments of hell with God himſelf, contained a ſtrong objection againſt the truth of chriſtianity, which has been ſuppoſed to teach it; and therefore they have interpreted the terms *eternal* and

and *everlaſting* in a limited ſenſe, of which they are certainly capable. But it ought to be obſerved, that theſe learned writers have contended for ſuch a portion of ſufferings in the future world, and ſuch a duration of them, as is fully ſufficient to anſwer all the purpoſes of a religious life, and to convert ſinners from vice and wickedneſs. The whole controverſy relating to this important queſtion, may be reduced to a narrow compaſs: either the abſolute eternity of hell torments is conſiſtent with the mercy and juſtice of the benevolent Father of all rational creatures, or it is not: if it be conſiſtent, there is no harm in taking the Scripture expreſſions in the higheſt and moſt unlimited ſenſe: but on the other hand, if the puniſhment of wilful ſinners in everlaſting fire, for millions and millions of ages, be abſolutely inconſiſtent with all the rational ſentiments we can form of our gracious and good Creator; then the Scripture expreſſions, in which the puniſhment of the damned is ſet forth, muſt be interpreted in a lower ſenſe, ſo as to denote a laſting duration, it being well known, that the terms, *eternal* and *everlaſting*, very often ſignify in Scripture a limited duration. It may be juſtly obſerved, that thoſe hardened ſinners who will not be influenced to reform their lives by a view of dreadful torments for ſeveral hundred, or a thouſand years, would not be worked upon by an eternity of them in view: if men act upon the ſober principles of reaſon, the former will be ſufficient; if they do not, the latter will be diſregarded.

Your concluſion is this: "How far then Chriſtian piety would be promoted by the Appellant's intended reformation of our faith, may be eaſily imagined. But you, my fellow Chriſtians, are not

not, I hope, to be thus amuſed. The plain declarations of Scripture, and the direct conſequential doctrines from them, faithfully pointed out to you by thoſe whom Chriſt hath appointed your teachers and guides, will ſufficiently engage you to preſerve that faith whole and entire, upon which our Lord and Maſter hath built his church: and your Chriſtian charity will lead you with me to pray for the enlightening of your Appellant's mind, and the minds of all thoſe who with him are in error and deluſion; that they may clearly ſee the things which belong to their peace, and underſtand and confeſs, that great is the myſtery of godlineſs; God was manifeſted in the fleſh, juſtified in the Spirit, ſeen of Angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, and received up into glory. Now unto him who is able to keep you from falling, and to preſent you faultleſs before the preſence of his glory with exceeding joy, to the only wiſe God our Saviour, be glory and majeſty, dominion and power, both now and ever. *Amen.*"

Anſ. That the church of England wants a reformation in ſeveral reſpects, has been clearly and unanſwerably ſhewn by the worthy and Chriſtian authors of Free and Candid Diſquiſitions, *&c.* printed for Millar. Surely, if our articles and forms of worſhip, were reduced to the ſtandard of Scripture, it would be attended with bleſſed effects. Rational forms of devotion, founded upon the expreſs authority of Scripture, muſt be better calculated to promote ſincere piety, and to ſecure the favour of the Almighty, than a worſhip offered up to an object without any warrant from Scripture, or to God under a falſe character, without the leaſt colour of evidence from his holy word. The faith

faith once delivered to the ſaints in plainneſs and ſimplicity, when ſincerely embraced and profeſſed, is more likely to influence our lives and actions, than the profeſſion of our faith in dark and contradictory expreſſions, never heard of in the days of the Apoſtles, and of which the learned cannot give a ſatisfactory account, and the unlearned have no more notion, than if the whole had been expreſſed in Greek or Latin.

I have not amuſed my fellow-chriſtians with vain imaginations, but have faithfully delivered to them an account of the primitive and apoſtolical faith, and likewiſe the evidence on which it is founded. I have laid before Chriſtian people plain declarations of Scripture, interpreted by common ſenſe. You do well to add to plain declarations of Scripture, *direct conſequential doctrines*; only I would rather call them, remote conſequential doctrines. Be pleaſed to conſider, that the faith required of us as neceſſary to ſalvation, cannot depend upon conſequential arguings: as it was deſigned for the poor, mean and unlearned, as well as the wiſe and learned, it muſt undoubtedly be expreſſed in plain and familiar language, adapted to the capacities of all. The ſame conſequential arguings, which are brought to prove the Athanaſian Trinity, will equally prove Angels, Moſes, and the Apoſtles to be conſubſtantial with God; which demonſtrates the abſurdity of ſuch conſequential arguings, as I have ſhewn in ſeveral inſtances. But then, theſe *conſequential doctrines are pointed out by thoſe whom Chriſt hath appointed the guides and teachers of his people*, and therefore, Chriſtian people may ſecurely depend upon the faith which they have received from their teachers. Here you are got again to implicit faith, and an abſolute

abſolute obedience to church authority in matters of faith: whereas a few pages before, you quoted an exhortation of St. John, which neceſſarily implies a right in Chriſtian people to examine all doctrines by the word of God, and to determine for themſelves whether they are agreeable to it, or not. It is very remarkable, that St. Paul and the reſt of the Apoſtles, though they were inſpired with the Spirit of God, never claimed to themſelves a power of delivering any doctrine without a commiſſion from Chriſt; they fairly diſclaimed all authority to add to, or take away from, the faith once delivered to the ſaints: and conſequently, it muſt be the higheſt preſumption for the greateſt mortals, who profeſs themſelves miniſters of Chriſt, to impoſe new articles of faith upon the conſciences of Chriſtians, under the tremendous penalty of damnation; which is the very caſe of the author, and ſupporters, of the Athanaſian creed. Surely, you cannot maintain in good earneſt, that this creed contains the faith whole and entire, upon which Chriſt hath built his church; when you yourſelf have acknowledged, that *the very expreſs words of Scripture are, perhaps, not to be found in that creed*; (p. 2.) from which conceſſion it neceſſarily follows, that no Chriſtians are obliged to expreſs their faith in ſuch unſcriptural propoſitions; ſo that the Athanaſian creed is at leaſt unneceſſary for Chriſtian people, according to your account; and according to mine, it is a groſs impoſition upon their conſciences: and therefore, let us amicably agree, to baniſh the uſe of it from the public ſervice of almighty God.

Be pleaſed to inform your Chriſtian readers in what part of the New Teſtament it is written, that Chriſtian paſtors and miniſters are required to

give

give it under their hands, that almighty God is a Being, conſiſting of three co-equal perſons; that this conſubſtantial Being has determined to inflict eternal torments upon his creatures, upon account of a corruption of nature derived from Adam; that he hath ſelected in an arbitrary manner, a particular number for ſalvation, and conſequently, hath left all the reſt in a ſtate of reprobation. Theſe are ſome of the doctrines evidently ſet forth in the thirty-nine articles, according to the plain, literal, and grammatical ſenſe; which are ſo abſolutely incredible and infinitely contrary to the principles of reaſon and revelation, that even the authority of an Angel from heaven would not be ſufficient to eſtabliſh the belief of them in the minds of rational perſons. If Chriſtianity really exiſted in the New Teſtament, as repreſented in the hundred and fifty-eight propoſitions of the thirty-nine articles, it would be an unanſwerable argument, that it never came from the God of Truth. But the caſe is far otherwiſe; true genuine Chriſtianity, as it was left by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, is a glorious and rational plan, worthy of the one God and Father of all, from whom it was originally derived, and fit to be embraced by all ſincere lovers of truth and virtue. It is an amazing inſtance of the infatuation of learned men, to employ their power and abilities in defending and palliating groſs abſurdities, or at leaſt in ſupporting corrupt errors, which eclipſe the glory of Chriſt's religion, and have a natural tendency to promote ſcepticiſm and infidelity. But to return: it is likewiſe your buſineſs to point out to your Chriſtian readers, ſome plain paſſages in the New Teſtament, wherein it is declared, that they are under no obligations to regard any teachers, as

miniſters

miniſters of Chriſt, but thoſe who have ſubſcribed, or are ready to ſubſcribe, all the propoſitions in the thirty-nine articles. A ſincere Chriſtian, who ſpeaks expreſsly of Chriſt's appointment of teachers, is juſtly called upon to produce the eſſential qualifications of theſe teachers from Chriſt himſelf. In words you profeſs Chriſt as the head of the church, who hath appointed guides and teachers; but in reality you mean the authority of the civil magiſtrate, who hath eſtabliſhed by the act of uniformity, the terms and conditions required of legal miniſters; which, unleſs complied with, neceſſarily exclude from the public miniſtry the moſt worthy and faithful perſons, and who have all the qualifications preſcribed in the Scripture canon.

But it is my duty to acknowledge your Chriſtian charity, when you ſpeak of praying for the enlightening of the Appellant's mind, and the minds of all thoſe, who with him are in error and deluſion. In return for your Chriſtian charity, I ſolemnly profeſs that, if you had overthrown the Appeal by a rational interpretation of Scripture, I ſhould have thought myſelf obliged fairly and openly to have acknowledged it: the ſucceſs of your prayers would have appeared by a public retraction of the Appellant. But upon the moſt ſincere and impartial review of this important ſubject, I am deeply convinced, that I am engaged in the cauſe of God and truth. On the other hand, I hope your Chriſtian charity will allow me to pray in ſincerity, that all groſs errors and corruptions may be removed from this Proteſtant church; that our governors, paſtors and people, may heartily unite their endeavours, to begin and accompliſh a more perfect reformation, in order to promote the cauſe of pure and genuine Chriſ-

tianity through the world; and that all the kingdoms of the earth may become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Chriſt, *Amen* and *Amen*.

You conclude with two texts, of which I have given ſome account above for the uſe of common Chriſtians. Admitting that the word, God, was wrote by the Apoſtle, it muſt be interpreted in the ſenſe of a divine perſon, inferior to the one ſupreme God, agreeably to the expreſs doctrine of St. John. But the great Sir Iſaac Newton, has made it at leaſt highly probable, as obſerved above, that the word, *God*, was not originally in the text, but *which*. Again, with regard to the laſt text you have quoted, your view was to inſinuate, that Chriſt is ſtiled God our Saviour: whereas it has been proved above, that Chriſt is never ſtiled God our Saviour, it being peculiar to the Father, who is expreſsly diſtinguiſhed from Chriſt our Saviour; ſo that this is a ſolemn doxology to the one ſupreme God. But as your zeal is ſo very great, for the notion of a conſubſtantial Trinity, and you even pray for the converſion of others to the ſame faith, you ſhould have concluded with ſome plain declarations of Scripture, ſetting forth, or implying, a conſubſtantial Trinity, or with a prayer, or doxoloy, directed to Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, three Perſons and one God, according to ſome Scripture form. This would have been more for your purpoſe, than all the far-fetched deductions, and conſequential arguings, that the moſt ingenious divines are capable of inventing: and this would have had more weight with ſincere and pious Chriſtians, than the opinions of the moſt learned men in the univerſe. But you cannot expreſs your doctrine in Scripture language: all the paſſages, where the character of God is mentioned, loudly proteſt

proteſt againſt the Athanaſian Trinity; and all the forms of worſhip ſet down in the New Teſtament, demonſtrate even to eye-ſight the falſhood of the Athanaſian worſhip.

On the other hand, the faith and worſhip, for which I have contended, appear in the beautiful and majeſtic ſimplicity of Scripture language: there is one Spirit, one Lord, one God and Father of all.—— Whatſoever ye do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jeſus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him.—— To God only wiſe, be glory through Jeſus Chriſt.—— The four and twenty Elders fall down before him that ſat on the throne, and worſhip him that liveth for ever and ever, and caſt their crowns before the throne, ſaying, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power: for thou haſt created all things, and for thy pleaſure they are and were created.—— And they ſung a new ſong, ſaying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the ſeals thereof: for thou waſt ſlain, and haſt redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and haſt made us unto our God, kings and prieſts, and we ſhall reign on the earth. And I heard the voice of many Angels round about the throne, and the Beaſts and the Elders: and the number of them was ten thouſand times ten thouſand, and thouſands of thouſands; ſaying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was ſlain to receive power, and riches, and wiſdom, and ſtrength, and honour, and glory, and bleſſing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and ſuch as are in the ſea, and all that are in them, heard I ſaying, Bleſſing, honour, glory,

and power, be unto him that ſitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever. And the four Beaſts ſaid, *Amen.* And the four and twenty Elders fell down, and worſhipped him that liveth for ever and ever.—— This was the faith and worſhip of the primitive Chriſtians, ſettled by the expreſs authority of God.

Thus I have gone through every material article you have advanced upon this important ſubject: but how far it carries weight and conviction with it, muſt be left to the deciſion of our readers. I wiſh you all happineſs here and hereafter,

And am,

SIR,

Your ſincere Friend,

and Servant.

OF writing books of controverſy there is no end: it is high time that this long controverted point ſhould be at laſt fully ſettled, and brought, if poſſible, to a final period. In order to contribute my mite to this bleſſed work, I will make ſome general obſervations upon the ſtate of the Trinitarian controverſy; and then I will propound two arguments drawn from Scripture; which, though they may in effect be found in ſeveral parts of the foregoing treatiſe, yet deſerve to be particularly re-capitulated with ſome additional illuſtrations.

The uſual method of proving the Athanaſian doctrine, is to collect together as many paſſages as poſſible, and ſome nothing to the purpoſe, in order to eſtabliſh the divinity of Chriſt, which no real Chriſtian denies in an inferior ſenſe; and the moſt judicious defenders of the Athanaſian doctrine freely grant, that the divinity they contend for, muſt be held in ſome reſpect inferior to that of the Father, by which a ſtrict equality with the Father is given up, in expreſs contradiction to the ſcheme they are profeſſedly labouring to ſupport. But when all the high titles and attributes aſcribed to Chriſt in Scripture, are preſented to the reader with all poſſible advantage; let it be obſerved, that our Lord himſelf and his Apoſtles, have aſſured us in the moſt ſolemn manner, that Chriſt *received* his being, high titles, and attributes from his God and Father; that God advanced him to exalted dignity and honour, upon account of his amazing humiliation and ſufferings; and that the whole redounds to the glory of God the Father. This plain and ſolemn account effectually over-

throws the argument uſually drawn from the moſt pompous recital of our Saviour's high titles and attributes, it being abſolutely impoſſible, that the ſupreme God ſhould have any thing *given* him by any being whatſoever: for according to the unanſwerable declaration of St. Paul, Who hath firſt *given* to him, and it ſhall be recompenſed to him again? For of him, and through him, and to him are all things; to whom be glory for ever, Rom. ii. 35, 36. From whence it follows with demonſtrative evidence, that Chriſt, who was *given by God*, who *received his all from God*, is a perſon in his moſt exalted ſtate, inferior to the one ſupreme God and Father of all; and conſequently, the Athanaſian doctrine, which repreſents him as equal to the Father as touching his Godhead, is manifeſtly falſe.

Again, with regard to the ſupreme divinity of the Holy Spirit, which is a point eſſentially neceſſary to complete a conſubſtantial Trinity, the Athanaſian defenders either evade entering into a particular diſcuſſion of his divinity; or elſe, they employ far fetched deductions, and remote conſequential arguings, which are of equal force to prove the divinity of other inferior beings, as well as the Holy Ghoſt. Their very manner of producing their evidence, demonſtrates the weakneſs of their cauſe; it being a clear caſe, that men of ſenſe and learning would not have recourſe to far-fetched deductions, if they were furniſhed with direct and poſitive evidence.

It may not be improper upon this occaſion to ſhew upon what ſlight grounds points in divinity deemed fundamental, have been determined by large bodies of men.

It

It appears by church hiſtory, that there was a great ſchiſm between the eaſtern and weſtern churches, occaſioned by their different manner of explaining the proceſſion of the Holy Spirit. The Greek, or eaſtern church, maintained, that the Holy Spirit received the divine eſſence from the Father only: whereas the Latin held, that the Holy Spirit received the divine eſſence from the Father and the Son. They both agreed, that the Holy Spirit was partaker of the eternal eſſence of the Godhead, but differed as to the perſon from whom he received it.

It is worth while to examine the foundation, on which this famous metaphyſical point, namely, the proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt, is built. The evidence produced by the eaſtern church is this: When the comforter is come whom I will ſend unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, he ſhall teſtify of me. John xv. 26. The argument urged by the Latin church is, that the Spirit is ſometimes ſtiled the Spirit of the Son; he is likewiſe ſaid to ſpeak from, and to be ſent by, the Son; from whence it was determined, that the divine eſſence was communicated to the Spirit by the Son as well as the Father, it being on both ſides taken for granted, that the divine eſſence or ſubſtance was communicated to the Spirit. Now the expreſſion in Greek is, (το Πνευμα της αληθειας ο παρα τε πατρος εκπορευεται) the Spirit of truth which proceedeth from (or goeth out from) the Father: if any proceſſion relating to metaphyſical eſſence, had been intended, it ſhould have been expreſſed thus: (εκπορευεται εκ τε πατρος) though even in that caſe, an eternal and eſſential proceſſion could not have been neceſſarily inferred; for (εκπορευεσθι, or εξελθειν εκ τινος) when

uſed of a perſon, ſignifies a local proceſſion: (See John viii. 42. Acts xv. 24. 1 John ii. 19.) But (εκπορευεται παρα τϐ πατρος) neceſſarily ſignifies, according to the ſtrict propriety of the Greek, that the Spirit goeth out, or is ſent out, from the Father; which deſcription of the Holy Spirit, points out the reaſon of our Saviour's former words, That he would ſend the Holy Spirit from the Father; and likewiſe ſhews, that the Holy Spirit is the firſt miniſter of the Father in the execution of very important offices. It is an amazing inſtance of the infatuation of learned men, to extract from ſuch plain words, the monſtrous doctrine of the Holy Spirit's receiving the divine eſſence from the Father, to which point they have no more relation, than what is ſaid of Angels, that they ſtand before the throne of God, and are ſent forth to execute various offices for the benefit of the church. The Holy Spirit, indeed, is the chief of the miniſtring Spirits, who, by reaſon of his eminency, is ſingled out of the number of the other Angels, and employed by God and Chriſt, in higher offices than the reſt. He is ſometimes ſtiled the Spirit of the Son, becauſe Chriſt received a commiſſion from the Father to ſend the Spirit.

I now beg leave to propound two Scripture arguments, to the ſerious conſideration of the learned defenders of the Athanaſian Trinity.

1. I hope it may be aſſumed as a principle agreed upon by Proteſtants and Chriſtians, that the New Teſtament was deſigned to give Jews and Gentiles right notions of almighty God, more eſpecially the latter, who were groſly ſunk in ſuperſtition and idolatry. If then the Athanaſian Trinity be the expreſs doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, it neceſſarily

neceſſarily follows, that the moſt preciſe and exact definition of the one ſupreme God, is a being conſiſting of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; or when we think, or ſpeak of God under his true character, we ſhould conſider him as three Perſons and one God: thus Dr. Waterland expreſsly allows the truth of this obſervation, when he ſays in his ſermons, (p. 142.) *In ſtrictneſs the one God is the whole Trinity*; and Dr. Mc Donnell contends, that the term, God, when uſed ſingly and alone, comprehends Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt: and therefore we ought to find this preciſe and exact deſcription of the one God, ſtrongly inſiſted upon in the books of the New Teſtament. Now upon a ſtrict enquiry it appears, that the word, God, occurs twelve hundred and eighty-eight times: there are ſeveral hundred texts, wherein the Father is ſtiled God abſolutely, by way of eminence, it being impoſſible by the conſtruction itſelf, that it ſhould have any other ſenſe. It is reaſonable to underſtand the word, God, in the ſame ſenſe in all other texts, excepting thoſe few, wherein the word is applied to Chriſt, and other beings, in an inferior ſenſe, expreſsly warranted by the ſacred writers. There is not one text, wherein the word, God, neceſſarily ſignifies more perſons than one. There is not one text, wherein we are obliged to underſtand it of three Perſons; the ſacred writers have not afforded us the leaſt plauſible pretence, or colour, for any ſuch ſenſe. What Dr. Mc Donnell has alledged to prove it, has been effectually overthrown.

We are agreed on all ſides, that the New Teſtament is a book containing an expreſs revelation from heaven; one great deſign whereof is, to ſet men right with regard to their notions of almighty God:

God: and yet the moſt exact, preciſe, and formal deſcription of God, upon the ſuppoſition of the truth of the Athanaſian doctrine, is not ſo much as once ſet forth in this ſacred book; nay, great numbers of paſſages, wherein God is mentioned, are abſolutely inconſiſtent with it. Add to this, that the ſacred writers have profeſſedly, and in a very ſolemn manner determined, that the one ſupreme God is the Father only, expreſsly diſtinguiſhed from the Son and the Holy Spirit, who are repreſented in variety of paſſages, as inferior to him, and acting in all things according to his ſupreme will and pleaſure: from whence I think it follows, with the force of demonſtration, that the Athanaſian doctrine of three Perſons and one God was never delivered by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, but was invented at firſt, and is ſtill ſupported, by the authority of men; it being a palpable abſurdity to ſuppoſe, that a co-equal Trinity in unity, ſhould be a Scripture doctrine, ſhould be revealed in the New Teſtament, on which foundation alone it muſt depend; when the ſacred writers profeſſing to ſet forth to us the right opinion of God, are ſo far from giving us the leaſt intimation of this doctrine in any one paſſage, that they ſolemnly inculcate a notion of God in vaſt numbers of plain paſſages abſolutely inconſiſtent with it. The learned defenders of this corrupt doctrine, are challenged to produce one paſſage in the New Teſtament, wherein the word, God, neceſſarily conveys the idea of three Perſons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. As a Trinity in unity has confeſſedly the appearance, at leaſt, of being repugnant to the common principles of reaſon; if the Apoſtles had intended any ſuch doctrine, they would not only have delivered it in plain and deciſive terms, but likewiſe they would

would have explained and inculcated it by variety of arguments; as they would in this caſe have been called upon to anſwer the objections of Jews and Heathens: but we do not find the leaſt hint of this doctrine in the diſcourſes of the apoſtles; nor the leaſt intimation that unbelievers or believers gave the apoſtles any trouble upon this account. As certain as the New Teſtament contains a juſt deſcription of Almighty God, ſo certain is it that the Athanaſian Trinity has demonſtratively no foundation there.

2. Again, I hope it may be aſſumed as a point agreed upon by proteſtants and chriſtians, that the New Teſtament was deſigned to ſet Jews and Gentiles right in the important duty of religious worſhip; as the notions of the former were imperfect with regard to this duty, and the notions of the latter were groſly corrupted with ſuperſtition and idolatry. Now upon an exact enquiry it appears, that the worſhip of a conſubſtantial Trinity, or three perſons and one God, is ſo far from being found in any part of the New Teſtament, that *all* the paſſages, wherein we have any account of religious worſhip, are abſolutely inconſiſtent with it; all prayers, praiſes, and glory being either directed to the one God and Father of all, or to his ultimate glory: all perſons and beings are cut off from any poſſible pretences to religious invocation, excepting the one ſupreme Father, and Chriſt Jeſus, who is worſhipped, as Mediator, by his command, and to his ultimate glory. The learned defenders of the Athanaſian worſhip are challenged to produce one paſſage, wherein we are commanded or authoriſed to offer up any acts of prayer, praiſe, or glory, to three perſons and one God. If they cannot, as I *know* they cannot, it is demonſtratively

monſtratively evident, that the Athanaſian worſhip is falſe. That the New Teſtament ſhould be deſigned to inſtruct us in the great point of religious worſhip; and at the ſame time ſhould not only leave us in the dark with regard to an eſſential part of it, but ſhould likewiſe point out forms of worſhip in expreſs contradiction to it, is a ſuppoſition ſo infinitely abſurd, as muſt neceſſarily prove the means of baniſhing this corrupt practice from all the churches of Chriſt, where men have liberty to read and ſtudy the Scriptures, and to profeſs and practiſe in religious matters according to their conſciences.

I will beg leave to employ the aſſiſtance of Dr. Waterland, and his ſucceſſor in the ſame cauſe, Dr. Randolph, to compleat the demonſtration. The former has laboured the article of worſhip in his firſt and ſecond Defenſes of his Queries for no leſs than an hundred and twenty pages; which diſquiſition he has confined to the ſingle point of the worſhip of Chriſt: (all which by the way is ſummed up and ſolidly anſwered in the compaſs of two or three pages in the Appeal) (ſee p. 109 —111.) but he has not ſo much as attempted to offer the leaſt colour of evidence, or pretence, from Scripture to prove the worſhip of a conſubſtantial Trinity, or three perſons and one God. His remarkable ſilence upon this eſſential point at a time when he was profeſſedly conſidering the article of worſhip, undeniably proves, that this able pleader had nothing to ſay; which demonſtratively overthrows the whole ſcheme he was labouring to ſupport, it being manifeſtly impoſſible that a conſubſtantial Trinity ſhould be a ſcripture doctrine, as there is no inſtance found in Scripture of religious worſhip paid to any ſuch being.

The

The ſame obſervation may be made of Dr. Randolph, who in his three diſtinct treatiſes, occaſioned by the Eſſay on Spirit, has endeavoured to eſtabliſh the doctrine of a conſubſtantial Trinity, and was naturally led to conſider the article of worſhip: he ſtill perſiſts to urge the ſame pretences that Dr. Waterland and others have done before him, notwithſtanding the ſolid anſwers that have been frequently given by unitarian writers, and which are clearly and briefly ſummed up in the Appeal. But this learned and worthy divine, as I really eſteem him upon account of his valuable character, has not ventured to offer the leaſt ſyllable of evidence to prove the worſhip of a conſubſtantial Trinity; which I muſt beg leave to ſay was his expreſs duty to have attempted; becauſe he had probably vouchſafed to look into the Appeal, where a very great ſtreſs is laid upon this important point, and it is particularly obſerved, that this worſhip is not found in the word of God: and conſequently, Dr. Randolph cannot be thought to have done juſtice to the ſubject, notwithſtanding the praiſes he has received from ſeveral writers, and particularly his friend Dr. Burton, * till he has cleared up this fundamental article of the Athanaſian cauſe. But whether he has examined the Appeal, or not, he has expreſſed his zeal to keep up this religious practice in the church; and therefore it is his duty to point out the lawfulneſs of it by direct evidence drawn from Scripture. Dr. Randolph has, in a triumphant manner, preſſed the learned and worthy author of the Eſſay, &c. with the forms of the church as not to be reconciled to the ſentiments profeſſed in the Eſſay.

* Concio ad Clerum.

I agree with him, that ſome of the forms of the church in their literal ſenſe, and according to the known intent of the compilers, cannot, without a violent diſtortion of words, be interpreted in favour of the unitarian doctrine; and therefore I have given up the uſe of thoſe forms and ſubſcription to them, upon this principle, that no power on earth has a right to appoint the uſe of forms, that break in upon the unity of God, the grand and fundamental article of natural and revealed religion. But I muſt take the liberty to put the ſame queſtion with reſpect to Dr. Randolph, that he does with reſpect to the author of the Eſſay: can he profeſs, that what he believes of the glory of the Father, the *ſame* he believes of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, without *any* difference, or inequality; who has expreſsly allowed Chriſt to be *inferior* to the Father, not only with regard to his human nature, but with regard to his mediatorial office, and alſo with regard to his divine nature, as God of God; and who has likewiſe acknowledged the Holy Spirit to be inferior to Father and Son, in ſome reſpect? * The form of the church, quoted by Dr. Randolph, neceſſarily ſignifies, that the Son and Holy Spirit are *equal* to the Father in *all* reſpects: but how to make this conſiſtent with the Doctor's acknowledgment, that the Son is inferior to the Father in *three* reſpects, and that the Spirit is *inferior* to both in *ſome*, muſt be left to his own determination, who ſeems in this caſe liable to the ſame cenſure he paſſes upon others, and muſt be obliged to employ a little of that art and ſubtlety he ſo freely

* Vindication of the doctrine of the Trinity, &c. part I. p. 21. Part II. p. 13. Appendix, p. 27. By Dr. Randolph.

con-

condemns in Dr. Clarke, and the author of the Eſſay. I would humbly recommend it to Dr. Randolph's ſerious conſideration, how he can, conſiſtently with the character of a chriſtian divine, contend for the uſe of forms in the worſhip of God, which he does not venture to defend, and for which he cannot produce the leaſt colour of evidence from Scripture, and which, indeed, are inconſiſtent with the very ſentiments he has openly profeſſed. I appeal to the Doctor's own conſcience, whether he believes in earneſt, that it was the deſign of Chriſt and his apoſtles to eſtabliſh the worſhip of three co-equal perſons without *any* difference or inequality, and one God?

All that can poſſibly be ſaid in defence of the Athanaſian worſhip is, that it is a religious practice rightly deduced from the conſequential doctrine of three perſons and one God. * Dr. Waterland expreſsly owns it to be conſequential only, and not directly taught in Scripture. But what a dangerous thing it is to found religious practices in our ſolemn addreſſes to Almighty God upon conſequential doctrines, may appear by an inſtance exactly parallel.

One grand argument made uſe of by the Athanaſian writers is, that the Son and Holy Spirit are joined with the Father upon ſome ſolemn occaſions, as concerned in the work of men's ſalvation; and therefore they argue from thence, that they are equally divine with the Father; if equally divine, they muſt be conſubſtantial; and conſequently, they muſt be three perſons united in one ſubſtance: from whence they deduce the practice of invoking a conſubſtantial Trinity.

* Preface to his ſecond Defence.

In

In like manner and by the ſame ſteps, I can prove a religious worſhip that will perhaps ſhock the Athanaſians themſelves. In the New Teſtament we find God, Chriſt, and the elect angels, mentioned together in a very ſolemn manner; *I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the elect angels*, 1 Tim. v. 21.——*Grace be to you and peace from him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the ſeven ſpirits which are before his throne; and from Jeſus Chriſt who is the faithful witneſs.* As St. Paul bears witneſs very ſolemnly before God, the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the elect angels; and St. John expreſſes a pious wiſh of help from the ſeven ſpirits, (who are expreſsly called the ſeven angels in other paſſages) as well as from the Father, and Chriſt; therefore it may be argued, that the ſeven ſpirits, or elect angels, are equally divine with the Father and Chriſt, it being unreaſonable to ſuppoſe, that God and creatures ſhould be joined in ſuch high offices, in order to promote the work of man's ſalvation: it cannot be thought agreeable to reaſon, that Almighty God ſhould lay himſelf under ſuch reſtrictions, as not to be able to confer his graces without the joint concurrence of inferior creatures: if the Father, Chriſt, and the ſeven ſpirits, are equally divine, it follows that they are conſubſtantial, and conſequently, they muſt be nine perſons and one God: from whence this religious worſhip may be rightly deduced; O holy, bleſſed, and glorious ninity, nine perſons and one God, have mercy upon us, &c. I really think that this invocation may be as juſtly deduced from the New Teſtament, as O holy, bleſſed, and glorious trinity, three perſons and one God, there being nothing higher ſet forth in Scripture, when rightly in-

interpreted, of the Holy Spirit, than of the ſeven elect angels; the Holy Spirit, indeed, is probably one of the number, the principal or chief of the miniſtring ſpirits. The pious orthodox chriſtian upon hearing an invocation of a ninity, that never was practiſed in the chriſtian world, is, doubtleſs, ſurprized and diſturbed: but yet he invokes the trinity, three perſons and one God, which is equally abſurd and equally deſtitute of ſupport from Scripture, with piety and devotion. Had eccleſiaſticks in former ages happened to have hit upon the nine inſtead of the three; if the ninity had been ſettled by the authority of councils, and had been guarded by the uſual methods, whereby ſuperſtition has been ſupported: in a word, if the ninity had been part of the eſtabliſhed worſhip, enforced by penal decrees of parliament and convocation, it would have been as readily embraced by great numbers, as a co-equal trinity. Learned men would have invented many plauſible pretences to have ſet it off to the beſt advantage, and the number nine would have been eſteemed as myſterious as the number three. The notion of a myſtery makes the moſt palpable abſurdities eaſy of digeſtion, and reconciles the moſt evident contradictions. Nine, or nine hundred perſons, conſtituting one God, may be as eaſily believed, as three perſons and one God.

'Till theſe plain Scripture arguments are ſolidly anſwered by direct evidence drawn from Scripture, I cannot help judging, that the Athanaſian doctrine is effectually demoliſhed. And, as this is a common cauſe, in which the honour of chriſtianity is deeply concerned; I beg leave to call upon Dr. Randolph, Dr. Burton, Dr. Chapman, and Dr. Stebbing, the learned members of the two univerſities,

ſities, and all the learned clergymen who would be thought defenders of the Athanaſian doctrine and worſhip, to conſider theſe arguments with that impartial regard to Scripture as becomes the character of chriſtian divines, who profeſs to follow the doctrine of their Lord and Maſter Jeſus Chriſt. It is the duty of theſe learned divines either to give a ſolid anſwer to theſe plain arguments deduced from Scripture; or elſe fairly to own, that the Athanaſian trinity is not the trinity of Chriſt and his apoſtles, but owes all its ſupport to the inventions of men, and the eſtabliſhment of the civil power.

With regard to the point of the civil eſtabliſhment of religion, I muſt beg to be informed by thoſe chriſtian divines, who, when hard preſſed with Scripture arguments, are too apt to quote acts of parliament, in what part of the New Teſtament it is written, that it is the duty of chriſtians to have recourſe to the determination of the civil power in matters of religion: and likewiſe that it is the duty of chriſtian magiſtrates to enforce any particular profeſſions of faith and forms of worſhip by worldly penalties. I have carefully read over the New Teſtament with a view to this controverted queſtion, and can find nothing in this ineſtimable book that has the leaſt tendency to ſhew the abſolute duty of ſubmiſſion to the civil power in matters of religion; though chriſtians are frequently exhorted to obey magiſtrates in affairs of a civil nature. Chriſt and his apoſtles have decided the queſtion in this manner: *Call no man your father upon earth; for one is your Father which is in heaven. Neither be ye called maſters; for one is your Maſter, even Chriſt. Though we* (namely, apoſtles) *or an angel from heaven ſhould preach any other*

ther Goſpel, than that ye have received, let him be accurſed. Peter and John, when they were *commanded* by the civil magiſtrate *not to ſpeak, nor teach in the name of Jeſus, anſwered thus, Whether it be right in the ſight of God to hearken unto you more than God, judge ye. For we cannot but ſpeak the things which we have ſeen and heard.* In like manner, St. Paul, who was the apoſtle of the Gentiles, directly confronted the authority of the civil magiſtrate in matters of religion, and boldly preached up one ſupreme God, and one Mediator Jeſus Chriſt, in oppoſition to every eſtabliſhed religion of the Roman empire, though he was hated, reviled, and perſecuted for it.

The New Teſtament, indeed, is ſo far from making it the duty of chriſtians to comply with religious decrees eſtabliſhed by the civil magiſtrate, that they are exhorted to be very cautious, how they obey his commands, in oppoſition to the expreſs authority of God. I profeſs myſelf terribly afraid of the worſhip of the beaſt, ever ſince I ſtudied the book of Revelation with the beſt helps that this age has produced. The beaſt in this wonderful book moſt probably means the civil power; and to worſhip the beaſt, can have no other conſiſtent ſenſe, than to comply with forms of worſhip, and profeſs doctrines, not warranted by the word of God, but derive all their ſupport from the eſtabliſhment of the civil power. When Almighty God commands one form of worſhip, and the civil power commands the direct contrary; to practiſe in obedience to the latter, is in other terms to aſcribe the eſſential character of God to the civil power, as it is well obſerved by the learned Daubuz in his Commentary upon the book of Revelation: "Now it belongs to none but

God himſelf to impoſe worſhip on men, he being alone fit to know and determine how he is to be ſerved. Therefore to impoſe a new worſhip, as objects of worſhip or manner of worſhip, contrary to what he hath already determined, is to uſurp his power." This indeed is applied by the learned author to the corrupt worſhip of the church of Rome, ſupported by the beaſt, which, as he has ſhewn, naturally ſignifies the temporal power of the ten kingdoms, into which the Roman empire was divi ed. It is an unwarrantable preſumption in the greateſt mortals upon earth to alter the faith once delivered to the ſaints; and it is little leſs than ſetting up an authority equal to that of God, to appoint objects, or forms of worſhip, without any warrant from, and in oppoſition to, the ſolemn determination of God himſelf.

It was a profeſſed principle in the heathen world, as obſerved in my anſwer to Dr. M'Donnell's preface, that the civil power had a right to make, or appoint, their own objects of worſhip; and that it was the duty of all perſons to worſhip the gods of their reſpective countries, eſtabliſhed by law. This impious principle was propagated by the philoſophers as well as prieſts; ſo that, notwithſtanding ſome fine ſpeculations they entertained concerning G d, virtue, and immortality of the ſoul, they complied with the eſtabliſhed religion, how fooliſh or abſurd ſoever: and conſequently, ſuperſtition or id latry univerſally prevailed, without a poſſibility of reformation by human means. God himſelf took the affair into his own hands, and by the revelation of the Goſpel has not only given mankind right notions of his being and attributes, and appointed a reaſonable worſhip; but likewiſe he has made it the expreſs duty of chriſtian con-

verts

verts to give up the authority of the civil magiſtrate in matters of religion, which claimed the enormous power of making, or appointing, gods: they were commanded under the ſevereſt penalties to continue in the open profeſſion of Chriſt's religion, notwithſtanding all the proſecutions, or perſecutions, they were liable to for nonconformity to the eſtabliſhed ſuperſtition, and to expect their reward in another life. Accordingly we find, that chriſtians, during the firſt 300 years, generally acted upon this glorious principle, that it is the right of God alone to preſcribe in what manner he ſhould be worſhipped; they ſolemnly renounced the ſtupid and impious adoration of gods, eſtabliſhed by the laws of the Roman empire, in obedience to the will of the one ſupreme God and Father of all; they bravely underwent the greateſt ſufferings and even ſundry kinds of death, becauſe they would not fall down and worſhip the graven image ſet up by the mighty lords of the Roman empire. It is remarkable, that the firſt chriſtian writers earneſtly contended for the right of every perſon to worſhip God according to his own perſuaſion; that all force in religious matters is abſolutely unlawful; that nothing ſhould be more free than the choice of our religious principles. They likewiſe treated the eſtabliſhed ſuperſtition and idolatry with a proper freedom and ſeverity.

This was the behaviour of chriſtians, and in this manner they talked, when the laws of the Roman empire were in force againſt the chriſtian religion, and they were perpetually obnoxious to perſecution from the civil power. But who could have imagined, that chriſtians, when they had got the civil power on their ſide, ſhould purſue the ſame violent methods in ſupporting their peculiar notions and

practices againſt each other, which they expreſsly condemned in their heathen adverſaries, and which are abſolutely forbidden in the Goſpel of Chriſt? Who could have thought it poſſible, that divines who are ſtiled proteſtant and chriſtian, ſhould earneſtly contend for that impious principle, namely, that it is a duty incumbent on men to conform to the eſtabliſhed religion of the country; and that thoſe perſons, who by publick preaching and writing oppoſe any doctrine or religious practice ſettled by public authority, ſhould be puniſhed, as the law directs? This, I cannot help judging, is ſetting up the authority of the civil magiſtrate in matters of religion and conſcience in the place of that of God, and has a natural tendency to ſanctify all the vile ſuperſtition and impious idolatry eſtabliſhed in almoſt all ages and countries: it likewiſe is calculated to juſtify all the perſecutions that Jews or chriſtians ever ſuffered upon account of conſcience, as being expreſsly founded upon this pretence, that they oppoſed the religion of the country, and refuſed to worſhip gods eſtabliſhed by law. In truth, all external force is inconſiſtent with the nature of religion. Either men are convinced of the truth of chriſtianity by reaſon and argument, or they are not: if they are real believers, they do not want any compulſive methods to make them worſhippers of God in the way prescribed in his holy word; they will readily comply with Goſpel worſhip upon principles of conſcience and the duty they owe to God and Chriſt: if they are not real believers, external force of every kind is an improper method to make them ſo, or rather it naturally tends to produce inward unbelief and external hypocriſy: in this caſe truth and falſhood are put upon the ſame foot-

footing; the holy religion of Chriſt, and the groſſeſt ſuperſtition and idolatry are ſupported by the ſame impious method: and conſequently, the genuine religion of Chriſt is really hurt by, but receives no additional ſupport from, human eſtabliſhments.

To prevent miſconſtruction, I would not be thought to argue againſt any rational methods a chriſtian magiſtrate can employ to promote religion amongſt the people committed to his charge. I humbly preſume, that a chriſtian magiſtrate cannot diſcharge his duty more agreeably to the will of God, than when he puniſhes all ſuch outward actions as are violations of the eternal law of righteouſneſs, and are injurious to the members of civil ſociety. And with regard to matters of religion, he has, I think, a right to provide for the public worſhip of Almighty God by propoſing and recommending forms to his people, but not by impoſing the uſe of them by any ſort of worldly penalties; which forms, as being deſigned for great numbers of men, ſhould be drawn up as free as poſſible from all points of doubtful diſputation. Neither can a chriſtian magiſtrate be ſaid to exceed the bounds of his office, when he takes proper care to get the ignorant inſtructed in the fundamental doctrines of all true religion; piety, righteouſneſs, and ſobriety, on which the happineſs of human ſociety certainly depends. And as to points of ſpeculation and different ways of worſhip, the magiſtrate then truly maintains the religious rights of his ſubjects; when he protects them all in exerciſing their undoubted right of judging for themſelves, and of profeſſing and practiſing in conſequence of that judgment; when he diſcourages not only violent oppreſſions, but likewiſe all

abuſes and injuries, upon a religious account; when he reſtrains the fiery zeal of perſecuting and intereſted bigots from breaking in upon the civil rights of his other ſubjects, and maintains them all equally in that liberty, with which God and Chriſt hath made them free. This, I apprehend, is the only rational method a chriſtian governor is capable of uſing to expreſs his concern for the honour of God and the advancement of true religion, which cannot poſſibly be effected by force and perſecution. There muſt neceſſarily be variety of ſentiments in religious matters as well as other things, by the very conſtitution of nature which God hath given us; and theſe never occaſion any diſturbance in human ſociety, when men are left to the dictates of their conſciences in all ſuch caſes, that are not injurious to civil ſociety. It is the reſtraint of liberty, it is the attempting to bring men to uniformity of profeſſions by force and violence that has already done ſo much miſchief in the world, that all good perſons ſhould tremble at the thoughts of this deadly evil.

Having thus delivered my ſentiments upon the civil eſtabliſhment of religion, to which I have been naturally led; let this be the ſolemn concluſion of this famous controverſy, with which the chriſtian church has been more or leſs perplexed theſe fourteen hundred years; when Dr. Randolph, Dr. Burton, Dr. Chapman, Dr. Stebbing, or any other learned divines, can prove it conſiſtent with common ſenſe, that two perſons are equal in eſſential perfections to the one ſupreme God, from whom they have confeſſedly *received* their being, powers and offices, and who act in all things according to his ſupreme will and pleaſure: when they produce from the New Teſtament one plain declaration ſetting

ting forth, or neceſſarily implying, that the true, preciſe, and exact deſcription of the one ſupreme God is, a Being conſiſting of three co-equal perſons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, without the aſſiſtance of remote and conſequential arguings and deductions: when they can point out one plain inſtance or precept, that it is the duty of chriſtians to worſhip the Holy Spirit as God, and three perſons and one God, in prayer, praiſe, or glory: when they can ſhew, that it is the duty of a miniſter of Chriſt to profeſs his faith according to acts of parliament; and to offer up worſhip in compliance with the determination of the civil power, without any warrant from God: when theſe learned divines have clearly ſhewn theſe few particulars, which, if true, may very eaſily be done, as they chiefly depend upon plain facts; then I am obliged, as a ſincere chriſtian, to aſk public pardon for the offence given by the publication of the Appeal and this Defence, and to retract my religious profeſſions, and to alter my practice in the public ſervice of the church. But, on the other hand, if theſe learned divines cannot give impartial Bereans ſatisfaction upon ſuch important points, on which the whole ſtreſs of the controverſy depends; and if, when called upon, they are abſolutely ſilent, it neceſſarily follows, that the trinitarian controverſy is at laſt brought to a final period, as the moſt judicious defenders of a conſubſtantial trinity tacitly give up the cauſe by not venturing to plead, when they are obliged to deliver their anſwer to the queſtion where it pinches. In this caſe chriſtian divines are certainly obliged to act fairly, as well as the Appellant; and therefore I muſt take the liberty of reminding them of that ſolemn time, when we muſt appear before the judgment ſeat of Chriſt;

Chriſt; and beg leave to aſk their own conſciences, whether it be conſiſtent with the character of miniſters of Chriſt to employ all their abilities, learning, and influence in the world, to ſupport corrupt doctrines and practices, for which they cannot offer the leaſt colour of evidence, and which have done infinite miſchief to the cauſe of Chriſt's religion; it being in vain to expect the converſion of Jews, Mahometans and Heathens, whilſt they are taught to believe, that the doctrine of three perſons and one God, and the worſhip practiſed in conſequence of it, are fundamental points of the Goſpel of Chriſt? I am under terrible apprehenſions, that a regard to the act of uniformity, though eſtabliſhed by king, lords, and commons, will make a poor figure before Chriſt's tribunal, amidſt a ſurrounding company of martyrs and confeſſors, who endured bitter ſufferings, and laid down their lives, becauſe they preferred the commands of God to the authority of the civil magiſtrate.

As no power on earth has a right to appoint the uſe of forms that break in upon the true character of Almighty God, and the holy worſhip, ſettled and determined by his expreſs authority; ſo it is high time that the ſupreme authority of the one God and Father of all, ſhould be conſiſtently maintained, and a regard to it reduced to practice, in oppoſition to all authority civil and eccleſiaſtical of the whole globe, by which the worſhip of the one ſupreme God has been overclouded with numberleſs forms of ſuperſtition, and in ſome places quite extinguiſhed by groſs idolatry: and therefore I do in the moſt ſolemn manner proteſt, not only againſt the Athanaſian doctrine and worſhip, and all forms in which they are ſet forth or implied; but likewiſe

wiſe againſt the authority, by which they were at firſt eſtabliſhed, and are now ſupported in this proteſtant church: which is no more than maintaining this plain truth, that the determination of the ſupreme Lord of the univerſe, with reſpect to a matter he has reſerved to himſelf, is of infinitely more weight, than the decrees and authority of councils, popes, ſynods, convocations, and parliaments.

My name is of no conſequence to the public; but I profeſs myſelf an unworthy miniſter of Chriſt, conforming to the Liturgy of the church of England ſo far as it is warranted by, or not inconſiſtent with, Scripture, and profeſs a ready obedience to my ſuperiors in every lawful inſtance.

It may be proper to add the expreſs determination of the church itſelf, which contains a ſufficient vindication of my conduct in this reſpect.

Every prieſt at his ordination being ſolemnly aſked, *Are you perſuaded that the holy Scriptures contain ſufficiently all doctrine required of neceſſity to eternal ſalvation through faith in Jeſus Chriſt? And are you determined out of the ſame holy Scriptures, to inſtruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing as required of neceſſity to eternal ſalvation, but that which you ſhall be perſuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture?* anſwereth in theſe words; *I am ſo perſuaded, and have ſo determined by God's grace.* And the whole church ſolemnly declares, that *holy Scripture containeth all things neceſſary to ſalvation: ſo that whatſoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it ſhould be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requiſite or neceſſary to ſalvation: that it is not lawful for the church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's word*

word written:———wherefore, although the church be a witneſs and a keeper of holy writ, yet as it ought not to decree any thing againſt the ſame, ſo beſides the ſame ought it not to inforce any thing to be believed for neceſſity of ſalvation: that even general councils—may err, and ſometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God: wherefore things ordained by them as neceſſary to ſalvation, have neither ſtrength nor authority, unleſs it may be declared that they be taken out of holy Scripture. Art. 6th, 20th, and 21ſt.

Great numbers of declarations of the moſt eminent writers of our church might eaſily be produced in confirmation of the ſame doctrine, on which this proteſtant church is founded: but the biſhop of London's ſhort obſervation in a ſermon on church authority lately publiſhed, may be ſufficient: *No church*, ſays his lordſhip, *has, nor have all churches together any authority to make articles of faith; that Chriſt Jeſus was the author and finiſher of the faith, to which nothing can be added, from which nothing can be taken.*

With reſpect to the grand point of religious worſhip, every prieſt at his ordination is exhorted in the moſt ſolemn manner—*continually to pray to God the Father by the mediation of our only Saviour Jeſus Chriſt for the heavenly aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt.*

O Lord, who haſt taught us that all our doings without charity are nothing worth; ſend thy Holy Ghoſt, and pour into our hearts that moſt excellent gift of charity, the very bond of peace, and of all virtues, without which whoſoever liveth is counted dead before thee. Grant this for thine only Son Jeſus Chriſt's ſake.—Collect on Quinquageſima.

Lord,

Lord, we beſeech thee, grant thy people grace to withſtand the temptations of the world, the fleſh, and the devil, and with pure hearts and minds to follow thee the only God, through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord. Collect for Sunday 18th after Trinity.

O God, the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, our only Saviour, the Prince of peace, look down in much pity and compaſſion upon this church and nation, now ſeeking unto thee in faſting and prayer; and grant, we beſeech thee, that our humiliation and repentance may have that bleſſed effect, that we may all cleanſe ourſelves from all filthineſs of fleſh and ſpirit, perfecting holineſs in thy fear. Give us grace, O Lord, ſeriouſly to lay to heart the great dangers we are in by our unhappy diviſions. Take away all hatred and prejudice, and whatſoever elſe may hinder us from godly union and concord; that as there is but one body and one ſpirit, and one hope of our calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptiſm, one God and Father of us all; ſo we may henceforth be all of one heart and of one ſoul, united in one holy bond of truth and peace, of faith and charity, and may with one mind and one mouth glorify thee, O God, through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord.—A prayer for unity appointed for the late faſt days.

Grant, O Lord, that in all our ſufferings here upon earth, for the teſtimony of thy truth, we may ſtedfaſtly look up to heaven, and by faith behold the glory that ſhall be revealed; and being filled with the Holy Ghoſt, may learn to love and bleſs our perſecutors, by the example of thy firſt martyr ſaint Stephen, who prayed for his murder-

ers

ers to thee, O bleſſed Jeſus, who ſtandeſt at the right hand of God, to ſuccour all thoſe that ſuffer for thee our only Mediator and Advocate. Collect for Saint Stephen's day.

This worſhip is expreſsly warranted by Scripture; and here we ſhould ſtop, if we take Scripture for our guide, or pay an uniform and conſiſtent regard to the ſolemn determination of the church itſelf, which in the 22d article has condemned the Romiſh worſhip, *becauſe it is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrants of Scripture:* and conſequently, we are fully juſtified in laying aſide the Athanaſian worſhip as being unſcriptural, though not ſo bad as popiſh ſuperſtition.

A Dis-

A DISSERTATION upon the famous Text, 1 John v. 7; or, Dr. M'DONNELL's Anſwer to the ſhort Account of it in the Appeal, fully conſidered:

YOU obſerve, that "the account given in the Appeal of 1 John v. 7. is far from being either juſt, or true;" Sincere Chriſtian's Anſwer, *&c.* p. 132.

Anſ. Let it be reviewed, for I have ſaid nothing relating to it, but what I thought juſt and true. It is aſſerted in the Appeal, (2d edit. p. 75.) that this text has not been found in one Greek manuſcript older than the invention of printing.

You aſk, "How came it to be in any, even at that time? And then you labour to ſhew, that it could not be interpolated at that time, becauſe ſeveral learned men were examining the errors and corruptions of the church of Rome; and ſuch a material corruption could not have paſſed unnoticed: and though many fair copies of the Greek manuſcripts were then probably made, to render the impreſſions more correct, which, I ſuppoſe, are the manuſcripts referred to by the Appellant, yet it was morally impoſſible, that the addition ſhould be then foiſted in, without being obſerved and cenſured. And therefore it follows, that it muſt have been, at leaſt, in as many manuſcripts before the invention of printing, as were then made for the above purpoſes, in the ſeveral different places where printing was firſt authorized." Page 133.

Anſ.

Anſ. Since the publication of the Appeal, the public has been favoured with a learned diſſertation of the great Sir Iſaac Newton upon this very text, who has unanſwerably ſhewn, that it is wanting in all the old Greek manuſcripts. More particularly, as to your objection about the time of the invention of printing, when you take it for granted, that this text appeared in ſome Greek manuſcripts, from whence the Greek Teſtament was firſt printed, he has overthrown the foundation, on which this pretence is built, by clearly proving that thoſe, who printed the Greek Teſtament, did generally omit *the teſtimony of the three in Heaven*, except in Spain. Eraſmus, in his firſt and ſecond edition of the Greek Teſtament, omitted this text, in the year of our Lord 1516, and 1519. Sir Iſaac has likewiſe pointed out ſeveral other editions, printed about that time, that omitted this text. He has likewiſe ſhewn, that the firſt edition in Greek, which has the teſtimony of *the three in Heaven*, was that of Cardinal Ximenes, publiſhed at Complutum in Spain, in 1521. —— That the next was Eraſmus's third edition of the Greek Teſtament, in 1522. —— And that the next was that of Robert Stephens, in 1550. —— And that this is the original, and authority of the printed editions through all the Weſt.

With regard to the firſt, namely, that of Cardinal Ximenes, this extraordinary perſon has ſhewn, that the text was inſerted without the authority of even one Greek manuſcript, and is no more than a tranſlation from the Latin, upon the authority of Thomas Aquinas. As to Eraſmus's third edition, wherein the text was inſerted, he has proved that this was done at the inſtigation of the Popiſh party, who loudly complained of the omiſſion

omiſſion, in his two firſt editions: hence to avoid their calumnies, as Eraſmus ſaith himſelf, he inſerted it upon an information out of England, that the text was in a manuſcript there; notwithſtanding that, he ſuſpected the manuſcript to be a new one, corrected by the Latin. But remarkable it is, that this manuſcript, on the authority of which the inſertion was founded, has never yet appeared in England: if it had really exiſted in this country, ſurely it would have been found, as being of peculiar value. Let it be carefully noted, that Eraſmus never ſaw the manuſcript himſelf, but only heard there was ſuch a one in England. As to Stephens's edition 1550, it has been undeniably proved by Mr. Emlyn, as well as Sir Iſaac Newton, that Stephens made uſe of fifteen manuſcripts in all, of which ſeven *only* had the firſt Epiſtle of St. John, and that the verſe was wanting in all the ſeven; which abſolutely demoliſhes the uſual argument drawn from Stephens's manuſcripts in favour of the text, as if it had been found in the remaining eight. Be pleaſed to read a letter from Father Le Long, prieſt of the oratory at Paris, to Mr. Martin, (Mr. Emlyn's adverſary in this queſtion) relating to Stephens's manuſcripts, inſerted in Mr. Emlyn's reply to Mr. Martin; and then doubt of it, if you can.

Upon the whole it undeniably appears, that thoſe who firſt printed the Greek Teſtament, generally omitted *the teſtimony of the three in Heaven:* and with regard to thoſe editions, wherein the text was inſerted, this was done without the authority of one Greek manuſcript, it being a tranſlation out of Latin into Greek, as plainly ſhewn by Sir Iſaac Newton.

With reſpect to your obſervation, of nineteen Greek manuſcripts in Dr. Gregory's collections, and what you ſay of Dr. Hammond, and Dr. Grabe; you ought to know, that this matter has been nicely examined, and particularly diſcuſſed ſince their time, by Mr. Martin and Mr. Emlyn, to whom may be added Dr. Clarke, Mr. Whiſton, and Mr. Jackſon, and above all Sir Iſaac Newton, whoſe diſſertation has been juſt referred to.

The reſult of the whole debate is this: Mr. Martin particularly mentioned two Greek manuſcripts as containing this text, and likewiſe pointed out the places where they might be ſeen, namely, Berlin and Dublin. Upon enquiry the fact appeared to be true; and at the ſame time it was plainly ſhewn, that they are both of a modern date. We have an exact account of the Berlin manuſcript, from Mr. La Croze, library-keeper to the King of Pruſſia, at Berlin, in two letters inſerted in Mr. Emlyn's works, vol. ii. printed for Whiſton and Noon, which he has demonſtrated to be a groſs impoſition on the public, forged by ſome ſordid fellow for lucre. The ſame gentleman has likewiſe given his opinion of the Dublin copy, that it is of a very modern date from the very ſhape of the letters: the learned * Mr. Jackſon thinks it probable, that that part of the manuſcript in which the text is found, has been added ſince the time of Arch-biſhop Uſher; but however that be, the beſt judges are agreed, that this copy is written in a modern and careleſs hand, and has not one genuine mark of antiquity: ſo that the matter of fact ſet forth in the Appeal, remains

* Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Dr. Waterland, printed for Noon, p. 79.

unſhaken;

unſhaken; there has not yet been found one Greek manuſcript before the invention of printing, in which this text appears.

Again, it is aſſerted in the Appeal, that between three and four hundred years after our Saviour's time, when this very point was debated on both ſides, this famous text was never quoted, which it is impoſſible to conceive ſhould have been neglected, if it had been in their Bibles.

You do not pretend to deny the aſſertion, but endeavour to evade the argument ariſing from it, by obſerving, that if "the Arian controverſy be meant at the time of, and for ſome time after the Nicene council, the whole and entire doctrine of this text was not the very point debated, it being confined to the eſſential unity of the Son with the Father; for which the advocates for that doctrine had ſufficient authorities from Scripture, without having recourſe to this: and it would have been improper to have produced ſuch a text, which they foreſaw would bring on a farther queſtion about the Holy Spirit."

Anſ. Admitting that this was the debate for ſome time; I cannot help judging, that ſuch a violent party-man as Athanaſius, would have been very glad of the aſſiſtance of ſuch a text, if he had known it; and that he certainly would have quoted this text, appears plain from hence, that he makes frequent uſe of the form in baptiſm, wherein the Holy Spirit is mentioned, as well as the Son: and conſequently, the reaſon which you give for the omiſſion of this text, is weak and trifling.

But I really meant not only the controverſy relating to the Son, but likewiſe the Holy Spirit, which came on, as you rightly obſerve, ſoon afterwards.

wards: And ſurely, then we might expect to ſee a text quoted, that has been always thought ſo direct for the purpoſe, and on which ſo much ſtreſs has been laid by divines of later ages; eſpecially, if it be conſidered, that the reputed Orthodox were hunting at that time with all poſſible earneſtneſs for every text, and ſound of a text, that could be wire-drawn to maintain their point; and yet we find an abſolute ſilence with reſpect to this famous text. I ſhall mention ſome remarkable inſtances of authors, whoſe buſineſs it was to quote this text, becauſe they were profeſſedly arguing about the Holy Spirit, as well as the Son: of this kind are the fathers of the council of Sardica, in their ſynodical epiſtle; in which for proof of a Trinity of Perſons in one Eſſence, they produce John x. 30. but not theſe words, *The Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and theſe three are one*; which would have been more for their purpoſe. It is obſervable, that the Fathers concerned in this council, came from ſeveral quarters of Aſia, Africa, and Europe, and conſequently, they could not be ignorant of this famous text, if it had exiſted in the Chriſtian world.—— Epiphanius, Baſil, Nyſſen, Nazianzen, Didymus, Cryſoſtom, Cyril of Alexandria, Ambroſe, Jerom, Auſtin, and ſeveral others, though they were profeſſedly treating of the Deity of the Holy Spirit, as well as of that of the Son, never cited theſe words; and remarkable it is, that ſome of theſe writers quote the words going before and immediately following.

The matter of fact is ſo glaring, that you are obliged to grant that "the text was never once mentioned by the controverſial writers upon the ſubject of the Trinity, in the fourth and fifth ages:

ages: which you ſuppoſe might be owing to the ſmall number of copies, which had been faithfully taken, being either borne down by the far greater number of imperfect copies, or rather kept up in the hands of a few, during the times of perſecution; and the Arians again, getting perhaps what of them had crept abroad into their own hands, while power favoured them; the Orthodox did not chuſe to build any thing upon the *few* remaining." Page 139.

Anſ. If there had been one genuine copy in the whole Chriſtian world, the Orthodox would certainly have found it out, and made uſe of it. Your ſuppoſition about the Arians is nothing, unleſs you could prove that the Arians ſecured all the copies, in which the text was found, whilſt they were favoured in the latter end of the reign of Conſtantius; which is abſolutely impoſſible, becauſe the Orthodox had all the power in their hands before this time; and after the death of Conſtantius, the conſubſtantial faith generally prevailed in the Weſt: and therefore, if the Arians had been guilty of any foul play with regard to this text, we ſhould have heard loud complaints of it from the Orthodox, and particularly Athanaſius. But we find an abſolute ſilence as to any ſuch tranſaction. According to your own ſuppoſition, which you make without the leaſt colour of evidence, whatever copies the Arians might ſecure, the Orthodox had *ſome* remaining; and conſequently, the text would moſt certainly have been quoted by the Orthodox writers mentioned above, who were profeſſedly treating of the ſubject, and undeniably wanted the aſſiſtance of ſuch a text; as it plainly appears from their copious writings, that there is no argument, or text of Scripture,

which they do not often urge to ſupport their cauſe. That ſuch zealous Athanaſians ſhould be every where inculcating that text of St. John's Goſpel, *I and the Father are one*, and ſhould no where mention *the three in Heaven, and their being one*, muſt be thought an unanſwerable argument with all unprejudiced perſons, that no ſuch text exiſted in the Bibles of thoſe times: and therefore it is as abſurd to ſuppoſe, that Athanaſian writers ſhould take no notice of ſuch a text, if they had known it, as it would be for Papiſts in defence of tranſubſtantiation, to forbear quoting the words of our Saviour, *This is my body*. Upon ſuppoſition of the genuineſs of the text, the caſe is exactly parallel: but remarkable it is that this monſtrous Popiſh doctrine has the ſound of one genuine text to ſupport it; but the Athanaſian doctrine is deſtitute of the ſound even of one: upon which account this famous text, ever ſince it got footing in St. John's Epiſtle, has been eagerly contended for in oppoſition to the cleareſt and ſtrongeſt evidence. The zeal that many Athanaſian writers have expreſſed for this text in modern times, demonſtrates to my underſtanding the abſolute impoſſibility of its being neglected in the days of their predeceſſors in the fourth and fifth centuries, if it had really exiſted in any part of the Chriſtian world.

But you endeavour to ſhew, that this text did actually exiſt long before the council of Nice, becauſe Tertullian plainly refers to it, and Cyprian expreſsly quotes it, two primitive fathers in the third century.

Your account of Tertullian's reference is this: "Tertullian, indeed, doth not mention what Scripture he takes his aſſertion from; but the nature of his

his argument, and the manner of his expreſſion plainly ſhew it to be a direct reference to ſome certain Scripture. For after having ſhewn the perſonal diſtinction of Father and Son, conſiſtent with their eſſential unity, as ſet forth in that text, John x. 30. upon which however, his adverſary builds their perſonal unity; he then points out the perſonal diſtinction of the Holy Spirit, whom his adverſary's doctrine tended alſo to ſet forth, as in no ſort diſtinct from either Father or Son: for whoſe eſſential unity altogether, there is notwithſtanding, as ſtrong a foundation in the writings of the ſame Apoſtle, as for that of Father and Son: which therefore he clearly refers to, by immediately adding, *which three are one*; not one perſon (as the adverſary would have it); it being expreſſed in the very ſame manner, ſays he, in which it is ſaid (in the ſame Apoſtle's Goſpel) *I and my Father are one*, to ſhew the unity of ſubſtance (properly eſſence) and not the ſingularity of number (or unity of perſon). It is to be obſerved, that Tertullian having before proved, as well the perſonal diſtinction, as the eſſential unity of the two perſons, Father and Son, from the expreſs words of Scripture; his argument for the ſame diſtinction and unity of the three Perſons, would by no means have the ſame concluſive force, or rather no force at all againſt his adverſary, if he did not equally ſhew it with regard to both, to depend upon the ſame authority, namely, the expreſs words of Scripture. From whence you infer, that the text exiſted in Tertullian's time, and that not in the Latin, but in the Greek, from whence he muſt have taken it." Pages 135—137.

Anſ. You have repreſented Tertullian's words in ſuch a manner, that a reader not very attentive,

might eaſily imagine that the words were an expreſs quotation from St. John's Epiſtle, though you are obliged to grant, that Tertullian doth not mention the Scripture, from whence this paſſage is taken. In order to aſcertain Tertullian's ſenſe, let the context be ſet down *. The Paraclete ſhall take of mine, ſays Chriſt, as he himſelf did of the Father's; thus the connexion of the Father in the Son, and of the Son in the Paraclete, makes the three cloſely joined together, which three are one, but not one Perſon; as it is ſaid, *I and my Father are one.* Here we ſee that theſe words, *which three are one*, are not a quotation from Scripture, but an interpretation of his own deduced from what he had ſaid of the Holy Spirit taking from Chriſt, as he did from the Father; thus, ſays he, there is an union between the Son and the Paraclete, as there is between the Son and the Father; then in the next ſtep he deduces their cloſe union with each other; from whence he draws this concluſion, *that the three are one*, as it is expreſly written of the Father and the Son, *I and my Father are one.* The text in St. John's Epiſtle is this: *There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt; and theſe three are one:* whereas Tertullian's words are, The connexion of the Father in the Son, and of the Son in the Paraclete, makes the three cloſely joined together; which three are one, not one Perſon, as it is ſaid, *I and my Father are one.* Which plainly ſhews that this was not a quotation from St. John's Epiſtle, as being very different from his expreſs words: if it

* Tertullian contra Prax. De meo ſumet, inquit, ſicut ipſe de Patris, ita connexus Patris in Filio, et Filii in Paracleto, tres efficit cohærentes alterum ex altero, qui tres unum ſunt, non unus; quomodo dictum eſt, Ego et Pater unum ſumus.

had

had been cited from Scripture, he would have ſaid, as it is ſaid, or written, which is expreſsly applied to our Saviour's words, *I and my Father are one.* As Tertullian proves the union of the Paraclete with Chriſt, and ſo with the Father, from theſe words of Chriſt, *he ſhall take of mine*; this undeniably ſhews, that he could produce no text, wherein the union of the three Perſons is expreſsly affirmed, as that of the Father and the Son is; and conſequently, we have Tertullian's authority from this very paſſage, when his ſenſe is thoroughly weighed, that he knew no ſuch text as *the three in Heaven*, and their being *one*. Add to this, that Tertullian would certainly have cited this famous text in his voluminous writings, if he had found it in his Bible; and more eſpecially, when he became a Montaniſt, it being more for his purpoſe than John x. 30, which he frequently quotes, and particularly in this book, contra Praxeam. Whereas this pretended text, ſo well calculated to ſupport his notion of the Trinity, derived from the Montaniſts, is never cited. It is worth obſerving, that in Pamelius's edition of Tertullian's works, dedicated to Pope Gregory the 13th, we have an index of all the texts of Scripture cited by this voluminous writer: but the learned editor takes no notice of the 7th verſe being cited at all, though he produces ſeveral inſtances of verſes in the ſame chapter expreſsly quoted, namely, the firſt, eighth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, ſixteenth, and twenty-firſt. Upon the whole, we have the higheſt reaſon to believe that, as Tertullian in his copious writings, never quotes this famous text, it did not exiſt in his days, either in the Latin, or the Greek.

But

But you obſerve, that "Cyprian, the diſciple of Tertullian, is ſtill more explicit. In his book concerning the unity of the church, he hath theſe words: the Lord ſaith, *I and my Father are one*; and again, of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, it is written, *and theſe three are one*. Now, how of theſe laſt words it can be ſaid, that they are only a myſtical interpretation of the 8th verſe, no man, I am ſure, of common ſenſe can at all imagine. And yet Dr. Clarke hath ſtrangely run into it, building his conjecture upon the weak and groundleſs ſurmiſes of two Latin fathers, Eucherius and Facundus, who lived long after the days of Cyprian, though confronted by the expreſs authority of another, as able as either of them, and older than the laſt. With reſpect to Eucherius, it has been proved, that he quoted this text in the beginning of the fifth century: while Facundus, who lived about the middle of the ſixth century, not finding it in the copies conſulted by him, and yet expreſsly quoted by Cyprian, endeavours to account for this, by turning Cyprian's words into a myſtical interpretation of the eighth verſe; which however, was not thought of till above an hundred years after Cyprian." Pages 137, 138.

Anſ. You ſet out very unfortunately; for the queſtion is not, whether the myſtical interpretation of the 8th verſe be right and juſt; but whether in fact it really prevailed: now you yourſelf are obliged to acknowledge, that ſome writers after Cyprian's time, and in the ſame country, did interpret the 8th verſe, namely, the ſpirit, and the water, and the blood, of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. And if other writers did give this interpretation, where is the abſurdity of ſuppoſing that Cyprian might do the ſame? Mr. Emlyn and

Sir

Sir Iſaac Newton, make it highly probable, that Cyprian's words refer to a myſtical interpretation of the 8th verſe. They have ſhewn, that Auſtin, a very eminent African writer, interpreted the 8th verſe in this myſtical way; and likewiſe, that Eucherius, biſhop of Lyons, in his queſtions upon this very Epiſtle, informs us, that the ſpirit, water, and blood, was generally interpreted in this myſtical way, though in a manner ſomewhat different from Auſtin. Sir Iſaac's diſſertation has this remark upon the citation of biſhop Eucherius's words: we may alſo determine, that the biſhop could not have in his copy, the teſtimony of *the three in Heaven*; as, I think, he muſt then have formed his queſtion, upon the whole, not a part of the paſſage; and becauſe he has omitted the words *in Earth*, which is never done by thoſe, who cite this teſtimony (ſee p. 12.); and therefore, it does not ſeem conſiſtent with the ſame Eucherius's quoting the 7th verſe in other parts of his writings, there being no ſort of occaſion for, or rather a great impropriety in, the myſtical interpretation of the 8th verſe, if the 7th had then exiſted. For in this caſe, the Apoſtle is ſuppoſed to ſpeak of the three Perſons in their plain and proper character in one verſe; and then immediately after in the next verſe, to mention the ſame perſons in a dark and myſtical way. Indeed, the myſtical interpretation of the 8th verſe, that obtained not only among the Latins, but the Greeks, as ſhewn by Sir Iſaac Newton, directly proves that the 7th verſe did not exiſt, it being a plain caſe, that men of ſenſe and learning would not have recourſe to far-fetched and myſtical interpretations, if a plain declaration proper for their purpoſe lay before them. With reſpect to the quotation of this text by

by Eucherius, to which you refer, Mr. Emlyn has offered very conſiderable evidence to ſhew, that it is an interpolation; or, admitting the genuineſs of it, this is the firſt clear mention of this text by any Chriſtian writer, which was not till a conſiderable way in the fifth century.

But to return to Cyprian's ſuppoſed quotation of this famous text: Facundus, who lived in Africa about the middle of the ſixth century, not only interprets the 8th verſe in a myſtical ſenſe, but expreſsly tells us, that Cyprian interpreted the words in the ſame manner. As to the authority of Fulgentius, which has been uſually brought to confront that of Facundus, to which you refer, Mr. Emlyn has ſhewn, that his teſtimony is ſo far from contradicting that of Facundus, that it rather confirms it. The evidence of this myſtical interpretation, is not at all weakened by your calling it the weak and groundleſs ſurmiſes of two Latin fathers. Surely, Chriſtian biſhops, muſt be thought competent witneſſes of an interpretation of a text of Scripture that uſually prevailed, and likewiſe of their own opinion relating to it. There is no direct evidence produced to ſhew, that Auſtin was the firſt who introduced this myſtical interpretation: on the other ſide we have poſitive evidence, that Cyprian ſo underſtood the words of the 8th verſe: and Sir Iſaac Newton ſeems to make it not improbable, that this interpretation was at firſt derived from the Montaniſts, to countenance their notion of the Trinity; and that Tertullian's words cited above, refer to this interpretation, becauſe he was a Montaniſt, when he wrote his treatiſe againſt Praxeas. Notwithſtanding, your charge of wilful obſtinacy, it is infinitely more probable, that Cyprian ſhould make uſe of the myſtical interpretation

tion of the 8th verſe, for which there is direct and poſitive evidence, than that he ſhould have a private copy, in which he found the 7th verſe, in oppoſition to all the Greek manuſcripts of the New Teſtament, all the ancient verſions, and all the councils, fathers, commentators, and other writers of at leaſt the four firſt centuries of the church; if Eucherius, who lived in the fifth century, quoted it, which is far from being probable. It is obſervable, that Cyprian does not cite the words as they are now in the text; for he ſays, *Father, Son* (not the word), *and Holy Ghoſt.*

Again, you obſerve, "that about the latter end of the fifth century, Eugenius, biſhop of Carthage, preſented a confeſſion of faith, with the other biſhops of Africa, to Hunneric, king of the Vandals; wherein they expreſsly cite theſe words of St. John: while the Arians, who were in high favour with that prince, never once, as to what appears, objected to their authenticity." P. 138.

Anſ. It has been juſtly anſwered by Mr. Emlyn, that the credit of Victor Vitenſis's hiſtory, in which this acconnt is delivered, is of little authority, as it relates ſeveral ſtrange miracles, not unlike monkiſh legends. But let its authority be admitted, it is very plain that this text had not been long in uſe, becauſe Auſtin and Cerealis, both African biſhops, of the ſame country, and in the ſame age, were unacquainted with this famous text. It ſeems highly probable, that at the latter end of the fifth century, ſome pretended this for text, which had been only a myſtical interpretation of the eighth verſe.

You do well to ſay, that the Arians never once, as *to what appears*, objected to the authenticity of the text at that time: for remarkable it is, that the

the reputed Orthodox have taken particular care to ſuffer nothing to *appear*, that the Arians had to ſay for themſelves. Surely, there muſt have been many Arian writings during the ſpace of two, or three hundred years. But their adverſaries, when they had got full power in their hands, demoliſhed all their books. It is the duty of all ſincere Chriſtians, to adore and bleſs the good providence of the one God and Father of all, that the Scriptures have been tranſmitted down to us, through corrupting, and corrupted ages of the apoſtate church, in a ſtate of purity, with reſpect to the main and eſſential points; and that ſo many primitive writers are ſtill left, by the aſſiſtance of which all groſs errors may be reformed.

The moſt probable account of the inſertion of this famous text is this: as the myſtical interpretation of the 8th verſe chiefly prevailed in Africa, it was wrote into the margin of ſome Latin manuſcript, which was a common practice, as obſerved by learned men; and afterwards it was tranſcribed out of the margin into the text. Neither is this mere conjecture; Sir Iſaac Newton obſerves, that in ſome old manuſcripts it has been found noted in the margin; and when it is found inſerted into the text, it is plainly ſuch as ought to ariſe by tranſcribing it out of the margin into the text. The ſame extraordinary perſon has diſtinctly ſhewn, that the text crept out of the Latin into the Greek, when the Greek Teſtament was firſt printed, and this only in ſome few editions, it being generally omitted by thoſe who printed the Greek Teſtament. Hence it is accounted for, why this text is wanting in the manuſcripts of all languages, but the Latin; and with reſpect to the Latin, it has been ſhewn by the ſame learned perſon, that it is

is wanting in the moſt ancient Latin manuſcripts. Hence we ſee the plain reaſon, why it was never cited by the primitive writers; why it appears earlier in the Latin than in the Greek copies, and how it came at laſt into the Greek ones of modern date, and in a Latin dreſs, as obſerved by the learned.

In the next place you call upon me to ſhew, "that any one learned man, who ever ſincerely profeſſed the eſtabliſhed belief of this doctrine, and impartially weighed and conſidered every argument that could be brought for, or againſt it, hath, either in this, or any other age, ſince the firſt ſettled acknowledgment of it, given up the authenticity of this text, as it is aſſerted in the Appeal." Page 140.

Anſ. I am ready to produce my vouchers under their own hands: the one is Mr. La Croze, library keeper to the king of Pruſſia at Berlin, and the other is the learned Dr. Wall. Theſe are the words of Mr. La Croze, in a letter printed in Mr. Emlyn's works: "I am ready to hazard life itſelf for that moſt certain doctrine of the divinity of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and other points deduced from it by our divines, but never could think that this doctrine (which may be clearly demonſtrated from many authorities in the New Teſtament) was poſſible to be maintained by doubtful and falſe arguments, without the utmoſt danger of the truth itſelf.—— What chiefly prevailed with me to depart from my former opinion (namely, the genuineſs of this text) is the ſilence of Athanaſius, who never appealed to that verſe of St. John, which yet would have been of great ſervice to him, if it had been found in the copies of his time." Let Dr. Wall's own words be produced, in his critical

tical remarks on the place. "This verſe, ſays he, is in no Greek manuſcript, nor was in the Bibles of the ancient chriſtians; nor ever made uſe of by them, in their diſputes with the Arians. Mill has ſo defended it, that he who thought it genuine before, will now conclude it to be interpolated by ſome Latin ſcribe firſt. *The doctrine is plain from other paſſages.*" *

Thus I have produced the open profeſſion of learned men, who believed the Athanaſian doctrine and the genuineſs of this famous text, but upon an impartial examination of all the arguments pro and con, have fairly given up the text. To whom may be added father Simon, who, I ſuppoſe, believed the Athanaſian doctrine. What Dr. Randolph's private ſentiments are, I know not; but certain it is, that he has not quoted it in his Vindication of the doctrine of the Trinity in anſwer to the Eſſay on Spirit, though he has collected the moſt conſiderable texts that are uſually alledged to prove the Athanaſian doctrine.

As to my aſſertion about the text being printed in a different character in the firſt Engliſh bibles after the reformation, you allow the fact to be true, but deny the motive upon which it was done, namely, that it was wanting in the original Greek. For you inſiſt upon it, that the text was in many ancient manuſcripts long before the invention of printing. But the contrary has been undeniably ſhewn, namely, that it was firſt inſerted without the authority of one ſingle Greek manuſcript. The difference between the Greek and Latin copies was

* The laſt ſentence I quote by memory, and therefore am not certain of the very words, but believe the ſentiment to be his: the other part I read in a treatiſe of Mr. Whiſton's.

in-

indeed the true reaſon for printing it in a different character, and not any difference, as you ſuggeſt, in the Greek copies, in which it was totally wanting.

Again, you take it for granted, "that from the time of Queen Elizabeth the diſtinction in printing the Engliſh bibles was prudently dropt, becauſe the perſons employed in reviſing the Engliſh tranſlation of the Scriptures thought, that the continuance of ſuch a diſtinction, with regard to a text, whoſe authority their own further enquiries found to be ſufficiently eſtabliſhed, would only prove matter of needleſs ſcruples and doubts in the minds of the people." p. 141.

Anſ. One would naturally judge from hence, that ſome new evidence had appeared ſince the year 1566, when the diſtinction was found, becauſe after this time the verſe was printed in our Engliſh bibles as genuine Scripture. But remarkable it is, that the more this affair has been examined, the leſs the evidence appears in favour of the text, which is always the caſe of a weak cauſe. Since the time mentioned above, the Alexandrian manuſcript, very valuable upon account of its antiquity, as being above fourteen hundred years old, has been brought into England, and in this the text is wanting. Beſides, Eraſmus's Britiſh copy has never been found, and the Complutenſian Teſtament, and the miſtake about Stephens's ſeven manuſcripts, were not thought to be ſo deſtitute of all weight, as now they appear to be.

Laſtly, it is obſerved in the Appeal, that the ſenſe of the apoſtle is much better without this famous text according to the reading of all the Greek manuſcripts: on the other hand, you labour to ſhew, that the apoſtle's argument neceſſa-

rily requires it, and therefore it ſhould be eſteemed genuine. Let our different interpretations be fairly reviewed, and compared together. And what you have offered, ſhall be firſt conſidered.

In order to ſhew the manifold defect the apoſtle's argument would labour under, if this text was omitted, you give a ſhort account of the former chapter and the beginning of this, to which I have no objection, as being plain and clear; neither do I object to what you have ſaid relating to the 5th and 6th verſes. After which you go on thus:

"But becauſe the apoſtle, by thus confining this teſtimony merely to the Spirit, might ſeem to contradict Chriſt's attributing the ſame diſtinctly in his Goſpel, to his Father, to himſelf, and to the Holy Spirit, John v. 37. viii. 18.—xv. 26. to obviate this, he immediately adds; for there are three that bear record in heaven; the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; and theſe three are one;——plainly thereby referring to the words of Chriſt concerning this teſtimony; who alſo in the ſame Goſpel, declaring himſelf and the Father to be one; the Spirit here, by the apoſtle, declares the Father, the Son, and himſelf, in the ſame manner, to be one alſo; and conſequently, the teſtimony of the Spirit to be that of the three perſons." p. 142.

Anſ. The reaſon you aſſign for the addition of the 7th verſe, namely, leſt the apoſtle by confining his teſtimony merely to the Spirit, might ſeem to contradict Chriſt's attributing the ſame to himſelf and the Father, is without weight and force, becauſe the Father's bearing witneſs, and the Son's bearing witneſs, are expreſsly ſet forth by the water and blood. God the Father gave a very remarkable

markable teſtimony to Chriſt, at the time of his baptiſm, when there came a voice from heaven, ſaying, *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well-pleaſed.* And the blood naturally ſignifies the teſtimony of the Son, which he exhibited by ſhedding his blood to confirm the truth of his being the Son of God, and his reſurrection from the dead undeniably proved that his teſtimony was true. And therefore the apoſtle had no occaſion to add *the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit*, as being witneſſes, to obviate a ſeeming contradiction. The profeſſed deſign of the apoſtle is to prove the certainty of Chriſt's coming by witneſſes. But how does the teſtimony given by *the three in heaven* prove the point? If their teſtimony be not given to men, how does it prove to them the truth of Chriſt's coming? If it be given to men, how is the teſtimony in heaven diſtinguiſhed from that on earth? It is the ſame Spirit which witneſſes in heaven and in earth. If in both caſes (namely, the witneſſing in heaven and in earth,) it witneſſes to us men; wherein lies the difference between its witneſſing in heaven, and its witneſſing in earth? If in the firſt caſe, (namely, its witneſſing in heaven) it does not witneſs to men, to whom doth it witneſs? and to what purpoſe? and how does its witneſſing make to the deſign of St. John's diſcourſe? * So that either the three in heaven bearing witneſs, is nothing to the apoſtle's point, or elſe it is exactly the ſame thing with the witneſſing in earth, and conſequently the witneſſing in heaven is abſolutely needleſs. From whence the impropriety of this famous text plainly appears, as it interrupts and ſpoils the apoſtle's ſenſe.

* This is taken from Sir Iſaac Newton's Diſſertation, p. 76.

When you infer from the words, that the Father, Son, and Spirit are one, as the Father and Son are one, and that the teſtimony of the Spirit is that of the three perſons, you argue upon the ſuppoſition, that St. John entertained the notion of three perſons and one God, which I have effectually overthrown; and likewiſe that the text is genuine, which has been abundantly diſproved: but let the text be admitted as genuine, and it by no means follows that the Spirit is one in the ſame ſenſe with the Father and Son, as ſet forth John x. 30. becauſe the apoſtle is expreſsly ſpeaking of bearing witneſs or giving teſtimony; and conſequently, the moſt natural interpretation of the three being one is, that they agree in the ſame teſtimony: ſo that all the learned pains you employ to eſtabliſh the genuineſs of the text, if you could effectually gain your point, will not anſwer your purpoſe with reſpect to the Athanaſian doctrine.

You go on thus: "But becauſe it might be ſtill queſtioned in what manner this teſtimony was conveyed, and what were the principal facts to which it is pointed, the apoſtle further declares, *that there are three alſo that bear witneſs in earth; the ſpirit, water, and the blood; and theſe three agree in one*: that is, this teſtimony tending to the one and the ſame end, is conveyed to mankind in a threefold manner." Your interpretation of the ſpirit, water, and blood, is the ſame with mine, only as to the blood, I add the reſurrection, which was connected with his death. "For that this threefold manner of conveying the teſtimony principally regards tranſactions here upon earth, is plain from the words, and *there are three that bear witneſs in earth*; which laſt words, *in earth*, together with the copulative *and*, in the beginning of the ſen-

ſentence, as they clearly refer to the foregoing mention of the three witneſſes in heaven, are omitted and changed in the Appeal; though in many of the Greek copies, where even the whole 7th verſe is omitted, theſe are notwithſtanding retained." p. 142, 143.

Anſ. Here you mention the ſpirit, the water, and the blood witneſſing the ſame thing with the three in heaven: for ſurely the Spirit witneſſing by his gifts, the Father by a voice from heaven, and the Son by ſhedding his blood and riſing again, is the very ſame thing with the three in heaven bearing witneſs. Now the deſign of the apoſtle being to prove to men the truth of Chriſt's coming by witneſſes, he could have no poſſible reaſon to ſpeak of the three witneſſing in heaven, becauſe the force of his argument depends upon the teſtimony being given to men; their witneſſing in heaven could not prove to men on earth the truth of Chriſt's coming. But if in both caſes you ſuppoſe them to bear witneſs to men, where then is the difference, as obſerved before, between the teſtimony given in heaven, and the teſtimony given on earth?

You ſpeak poſitively of many Greek copies retaining the words *in earth* together with the copulative *and*, where even the whole 7th verſe is omitted; from whence you draw an argument in favour of the text, as they refer to the foregoing mention of the three witneſſes in heaven. On the other hand, Sir Iſaac Newton, upon a very careful examination of this affair, aſſures us, that all the real Greek manuſcripts uniformly agree in this reading, *for there are three that bear record, the ſpirit, the water, and the blood; and theſe three agree in one.*

You go on thus: "The apoſtle having thus ſhewn the nature, force, and manner of the teſtimony, ſtrongly argues, as our Saviour did in a parallel caſe, John viii. 17, 18. that ſince we receive the teſtimony of fallible men, when attended with the requiſite conditions of quality and number; we ought much more readily to acknowledge this teſtimony of theſe three divine perſons, who from the unity of their nature, muſt infallibly concur in teſtifying the truth, and which therefore muſt be the teſtimony of God himſelf; and conſequently, it being as to the number of the witneſſes, alſo plainly unexceptionable, of infinitely gr ater force than any human teſtimony whatſoever. Wherein it ſhould be obſerved that the apoſtle could not with any propriety call the bare manner of conveying the teſtimony, and the facts to which it referred (which facts for the moſt part were merely human tranſactions) the direct and immediate teſtimony of God; if he had not in the 7th verſe declared who the witneſſes were. Nor could he affirm the immediate teſtimony of the Spirit, mentioned in the 6th verſe, to be as immediately the teſtimony of God, if he had not alſo ſhewn in the ſame 7th verſe the unity of the ſame Spirit with the Father and Son; and conſequently, that he was actually and truly God. For though to enforce the reaſonableneſs of receiving this teſtimony, he immediately ſubjoins; for this is the teſtimony of God, which he teſtified concerning his Son; yet becauſe the words of the 8th verſe, taken without any reſpect to the 7th, do only expreſs three differen teſtimonies of one and the ſame witneſs to three different facts; each of which however in human judicatures, would require two witneſſes at leaſt; and becauſe the teſtimony

timony of the Spirit in the 6th verſe, though it might even, according to your account, be remotely applied to God, is yet no more than the immediate teſtimony of one; which, therefore, by the apoſtle's comparing this teſtimony with the force of human evidence, is not ſo ſtrong, in reſpect of number, as the latter, and which he yet means it ſhould appear to exceed in all points: it is evident to make it ſuperior in point of number alſo, that he here refers to the three witneſſes ſpecified in the 7th verſe, and that the teſtimony of God the Father, is underſtood by him to imply the teſtimony of the other two. For he hath already declared, that this teſtimony is alſo the teſtimony of the Spirit; and that the Son jointly with the Father and Holy Spirit, bears equally teſtimony of himſelf, and that theſe three are one: the teſtimony therefore of each, muſt be the teſtimony of either of the other two, or of all together. The apoſtle therefore ſcruples not to add, in the 10th verſe, he that believeth in the Son of God, hath this teſtimony in himſelf; that is, he that believeth in the Son, muſt not only aſſent to his teſtimony, but alſo in that acknowledge the force of the united teſtimonies of the Father and Holy Spirit, the one ſtill reciprocally implying the other, and thereby be ſo fully poſſeſſed of the force of the whole evidence as to need no other aſſiſtance but that of his perfect faith therein to enable him to overcome the world, as he had before declared: to ſhew the nature of which faith, and the evidence upon which it is founded, he entered into this detail; of which, therefore, this full, clear, and fair unfolding muſt evidently ſhew, to every man of common ſenſe and reflection, the material defect the apoſtle's whole argument would labour

under, if this text was not admitted to ſtand a part thereof." p. 143—145.

Anſ. I agree with you, that the apoſtle in the 9th verſe goes on ſtrongly arguing, as our Saviour did in a parallel caſe, John viii. 17, 18. that ſince we receive the teſtimony of two or three credible witneſſes, we ought much more readily to acknowledge the threefold witneſs of God, namely, the ſpirit, the baptiſm, and paſſion of Chriſt: for theſe three are expreſsly ſaid to bear record or witneſs of the truth of Chriſt's coming: from whence the apoſtle juſtly obſerves that theſe three witneſſes are the teſtimony of God himſelf, not a Being conſiſting of three divine perſons, as you infer, for God in this very verſe is expreſsly diſtinguiſhed from his Son, and therefore neceſſarily means the Father. Surely God may be properly ſaid to witneſs at the baptiſm of Chriſt by the voice from heaven; by raiſing him from the dead, when he had ſhed his blood; and by ſending his Holy Spirit, which is expreſsly called the witneſs of God himſelf by St. Paul, Heb. ii. 4. *God alſo bearing them witneſs with divers gifts of the Holy Ghoſt*: and conſequently, the apoſtle might with the utmoſt propriety call the ſpirit, water, and blood the teſtimony of God, it being exactly agreeable to Scripture truth: ſo that the ſenſe of the apoſtle is plain, natural, and complete without the witneſſes in heaven; whereas the inſertion of them interrupts and ſpoils it.

What you obſerve next with reſpect to the Spirit, is directly anſwered by plain Scripture language already produced, which calls the Spirit's bearing witneſs the teſtimony of God himſelf, and indeed with the higheſt reaſon, becauſe God employed the Spirit in various ways to atteſt the truth of chriſ-

chriſtianity. Your inference, that the Spirit is one with the Father and Son, and conſequently, truly God, is founded on the ſuppoſition, that the text is genuine, and likewiſe that the unity here mentioned, has reference to nature and eſſence; whereas it neceſſarily ſignifies agreement in teſtimony, this being the only conſiſtent ſenſe to anſwer the apoſtle's purpoſe, if the text be admitted.

Your next paragraph proceeds upon the ſuppoſition that the ſpirit, the water, and the blood, are not three witneſſes, but only three different teſtimonies of one and the ſame witneſs to three different facts, each of which requires at leaſt two witneſſes; and therefore it is neceſſary to believe, that the apoſtle here refers to the three witneſſes in the 7th verſe; and that the teſtimony of God the Father, is underſtood by him to imply the teſtimony of the other two. Now the apoſtle expreſsly affirms, that the ſpirit, and the water, and the blood, are three diſtinct witneſſes, and that they all agree in witneſſing the ſame thing; (namely, that the Son of God is come) and the apoſtle no leſs plainly declares, that the teſtimony given by theſe three witneſſes, is the *witneſs of God, which he hath teſtified of his Son*; the ſpirit, water, and blood, may be juſtly ſtiled the threefold witneſs of God, as explained above, and conſequently, ought to be eſteemed of greater weight than any human teſtimony. By departing from the apoſtle's ſentiment, you introduce nothing but confuſion: you call the witneſſes three facts which require other witneſſes; whereas the fact to be proved was but one, namely, that the Son of God is come; and of this fact the ſpirit, water, and blood are repreſented by the apoſtle as ſufficient witneſſes, and very

very juſtly ſtiles their witneſſing the teſtimony of God himſelf, becauſe he was immediately concerned in exhibiting to men theſe three diſtinct witneſſes of the coming of Chriſt.

You are very ſollicitous to eſtabliſh the notion of three witneſſes; but you little conſider the conſequence, when at the ſame time you labour to ſhew, that theſe three witneſſes are one being; from whence it neceſſarily follows that they were but one witneſs: one God is but one witneſs, though doubtleſs of infinitely greater weight than millions of rational creatures.

It is remarkable, that this very text, admitting the genuineſs of it, demonſtrates the abſurdity of the Athanaſian doctrine. "Of all the notions, or ſentiments, we can form of our Almighty Maker, there is none more plain and obvious than this, namely, that the whole difference betwixt his teſtimony and that of any other rational being whatever, conſiſts in this, and in this only, that his teſtimony is moſt weighty; and exactly in proportion to the rational evidence there is, that ſuch or ſuch a thing is really teſtified by him: but his infinite perfections, particularly, his infinite veracity, only adds *weight* to his teſtimony, but by no means *multiplies* it: or, in other words, it makes him only a *more weighty witneſs*, but not *more witneſſes*, than the meaneſt honeſt man: his teſtimony is doubtleſs more to be regarded than the teſtimony of millions; but ſtill it is as ſingle, as much one, as his being is. As therefore *one being can be but one witneſs*; conſequently, ſince there are in this text expreſsly ſaid to be three witneſſes, or three that bear record, they muſt of neceſſity be three diſtinct beings, as much as three diſtinct witneſſes; becauſe *one being can be but one witneſs.* This is con-

confirmed by theſe words in the 9th verſe, if we receive the witneſs of men, the witneſs of God is *greater*; but was it ever heard of, in the whole chriſtian world that the witneſs of God is *more numerous*, as well as *greater?* or, where would be either the ſenſe or truth of it, if it were ſo ſaid? If therefore one being can be but one witneſs, which ſeems a ſelf-evident propoſition, where there are three diſtinct witneſſes (as in this text) they muſt be three diſtinct beings." *

It is remarkable that God in the 9th verſe neceſſarily ſignifies the perſon of the Father as diſtinguiſhed from his Son: and whereas you affirm that the teſtimony of God the Father, as underſtood by the apoſtle to imply the teſtimony of the other two; if by this you mean that they are one being, this is begging the queſtion, and ſuppoſing that the apoſtle had the Athanaſian trinity in his head, which I have effectually overthrown: in any other ſenſe it will not anſwer your purpoſe; the teſtimony of God may be juſtly underſtood to imply the teſtimony of the Son and Spirit, becauſe they are inferior agents, through whom God principally has delivered his teſtimony to men.

As to your expoſition of the 10th verſe, he that believ th in the Son of God, hath this teſtimony in himſelf, you proceed upon the ſuppoſition of the genuineſs of the 7th verſe: the plain meaning of it is, to ſhew what is the fruit or advantage of believing that Jeſus is the Son of God, which is this, that he hath received into his mind the ſame teſtimony of God, which is the ſame thing with

* This was communicated to me ſome years ago in a private letter by a very worthy and pious confeſſor of Glaſgow in Scotland, Mr. William Paul by name.

re-

receiving the witneſs of God, verſe 9. On the other hand, the apoſtle in the ſame verſe repreſents the evil of not believing the teſtimony of God, that this is in effect making God a liar, becauſe he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son.

Having thus particularly examined what you have offered in order to ſhew the defect of the apoſtle's argument, if this text was not admitted; and having pointed out the inſufficiency of your obſervations in every reſpect; I ſhall now conſider the profeſſed deſign of the apoſtle in the context, from whence it will appear, that his ſenſe is much better without this famous text, according to the reading of all the Greek manuſcripts. Now nothing can be plainer, (and you yourſelf are obliged to acknowledge it,) than that St. John is profeſſedly maintaining this fundamental article of the chriſtian faith, that Jeſus is the Chriſt, or Son of God; upon the profeſſion of which Jews and Heathens were admitted into the chriſtian covenant, as undeniably appears from the four Goſpels, and the acts of the apoſtles, where we have an account of the firſt converts to chriſtianity. The apoſtle likewiſe ſets forth the glorious effects of this Goſpel faith, when ſincerely entertained, that it enables true chriſtians readily and cheerfully to keep the commandments of God, which in other terms is loving God, and to overcome the temptations of this wicked world. This is evidently the purport of the five firſt verſes of this chapter: then the apoſtle proceeds, ver. 6. to eſtabliſh the evidence, on which this important article is founded; *this is he that came by water and blood, even Jeſus Chriſt, not by water only, but by water and blood; and it is the Spirit that beareth witneſs, becauſe the Spirit is truth:*

truth: that is, God hath afforded abundant evidence of the truth of Chriſt's coming, by a voice from heaven, which audibly proclaimed him to be the Son of God; by Chriſt's ſhedding his blood in atteſtation to the truth of his being the very Chriſt, and which was demonſtrated by his reſurrection; and this truth was likewiſe confirmed by the wonderful gifts of the Spirit, with which Chriſt and his followers were endued, and nothing can be a ſtronger argument than this, becauſe the Spirit is truth itſelf. Then the apoſtle in the next verſe gives a reaſon of what is declared in the ſixth, which neceſſarily refers to the ſpirit, water and blood: *for*, ſays he, *there are three that bear record, the ſpirit, and the water, and the blood*; *and theſe three agree in one*; that is, the wonderful gifts of the Spirit, the baptiſm of water, wherein God teſtified, This is my beloved Son, and the ſhedding of his blood, attended with his reſurrection, undeniably demonſtrate to all unprejudiced perſons, that Jeſus was really ſent by God, and is the very Chriſt, it being impoſſible to conceive, that Almighty God would diſtinguiſh an impoſtor in this extraordinary way. Then the apoſtle argues from the nature of human teſtimony to divine, verſe 9. the law requires but two conſenting witneſſes, and here we have three, the ſpirit, the baptiſm, and paſſion of Chriſt, the threefold witneſs of God, which he bare of his Son; and conſequently, the teſtimony of God is infinitely greater than that of men, and therefore ought to be more readily received. Verſe 10. he that upon this evidence has a real belief in the Son of God, hath received the teſtimony of God himſelf: but he that is not convinced by this extraordinary evidence which God

God hath given us, does in effect make God a liar.

Thus, if the deſign of the apoſtle, and the whole context, be thoroughly weighed, the ſenſe is plain and rational, and the argument reſulting from it is full and ſtrong, without the aſſiſtance of the teſtimony of the three in heaven; which, if inſerted, interrupts and ſpoils it, as obſerved before.

I cannot conclude without obſerving, that, as the apoſtle's profeſſed view was to point out the chriſtian faith, and the evidence on which it is founded, there ariſes from this very chapter a demonſtrative argument againſt the Athanaſian doctrine: for if it had been true, the apoſtle would have infallibly argued in this manner: *whoſoever believeth* that Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are one God, *is born of God*; and *who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth* theſe three perſons to be one God? and then he would have proceeded to have proved this doctrine by arguments drawn from Revelation. But inſtead of this, we find a plain and familiar truth propoſed, exactly agreeable to the whole tenor of the Goſpel; and likewiſe the evidence is clearly ſet forth, on which this truth is built, which is no leſs than the infallible teſtimony of God himſelf.

For God's ſake and for the honour of chriſtianity, let chriſtian profeſſors of all denominations be prevailed upon to give up the decrees of men in matters of revelation; let them learn to be content with the plain ſimplicity of the Goſpel of Chriſt; let them embrace all chriſtians as brethren, who in earneſt believe this important doc-

trine, that Jeſus is the Chriſt, or Son of God; and above all, who demonſtrate the reality of their chriſtian profeſſion by living as becometh the Goſpel of Chriſt.

FINIS.



EXAMINATION of the Biſhop of LONDON's Diſcourſe upon Philipp. Ch. ii. Ver. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.

AVERY learned and worthy dignitary of the church of Chicheſter has lately printed the Biſhop of London's diſcourſe upon Philipp. ch. ii. ver. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. and has taken care to to get it propagated among common chriſtians, which ſeems intended as a ſort of anſwer to, or rather preſervative againſt, the appeal to the common ſenſe of all chriſtian people, and which, I ſuppoſe, contains the whole of what this ingenious divine has to object in point of argument to that little piece. It is proper therefore that this diſcourſe of the Biſhop's ſhould be examined, which ſhall be done with all due reſpect to his lordſhip and the worthy divine, who has made this uſe of his lordſhip's diſcourſe; and eſpecially as, I think, it has a natural tendency to promote the grand point attempted in this defence, viz. to bring this famous controverſy to a final period.

His lordſhip refers the words of the text to three diſtinct ſtates of Chriſt, viz. 1. His preexiſtence in heaven before he came into the world. 2. His ſtate of humiliation, whilſt he was upon earth. 3. His exaltation, which was given him by the Father as a reward of his humiliation. In other terms, the *ſame* perſon who *exiſted in heaven*, lived and *ſuffered upon earth*, and was exalted to an higher ſtate of glory in heaven upon account of his humiliation.

From this account, which is exactly agreeable to what is contended for in the appeal and this defence, it neceſſarily follows that Chriſt is a perſon inferior to the one Supreme God, it being on all ſides agreed, that the Supreme God is incapable of a ſuffering ſtate. His lordſhip has not thrown out the leaſt hint, the leaſt ſalvo to guard againſt this neceſſary deduction; the tenor of his diſcourſe is ſo far from pointing out the uſual Athanaſian diſtinction, viz. that Chriſt ſuffered as man, whilſt as God he continued incapable of ſufferings, that he expreſsly affirms, (p. 53) *The Apoſtle conſiders Jeſus Chriſt as the ſame perſon in all his different ſtates of glory, humility and exaltation.* If the *ſame* perſon who *exiſted in heaven, ſuffered upon earth*, he muſt ſuffer in his higheſt capacity, and conſequently, the inferiority of Chriſt to Almighty God, is unanſwerably eſtabliſhed upon the principles of this diſcourſe.

Again, the words *thought it not robbery* and *made himſelf of no reputation*, ſignify in the original Greek, as his lordſhip obſerves, *was not fond, or tenacious of, did not greedily retain, but emptied himſelf.* This is the ſenſe contended for in the Appeal and this Defence.

His Lordſhip obſerves, that whatever be the preciſe Meaning of *Form of God* and *being equal to God, they are expreſſions that relate to the ſame Thing; ſo that he who is poſſeſſed of the firſt, has a a right to the laſt.* This ſenſe is expreſsly allowed in this Defence.

But I am obliged to expreſs my Diſagreement with his Lordſhip, when he explains the Terms in which Chriſt's pre-exiſtent ſtate is ſet forth, viz. *the Form of God and to be equal to God.* "The Form of God, ſays he, expreſſes and contains all

thoſe Glories, which Chriſt willingly ſuffered to be hid in his ſtate of humility——and thoſe Glories were certainly thoſe things of his own, which the apoſtle intended to ſhew that he did not look to, ver. 4.—— It deſerves to be conſidered, who, and what manner of perſon he is, to whom the proper and peculiar Glories of God, to whom his majeſty and power do belong, and ſo belong to him as to be his own. Should God communicate his Glories to a creature in the higheſt degree that a creature is capable of receiving them, yet the Glories of God ſo communicated to the creature could in no ſenſe be ſaid to be the creature's own glories. Our own glories are thoſe only which are proper and peculiar to our own nature; for, as the apoſtle elſewhere ſays, One thing differeth from another thing in glory." p. 28, 29, 30.

Anſ. I want to have ſome preciſe notion of his Lordſhip's expreſſions, *the proper and peculiar Glories of God, to whom his majeſty and power do belong, and to be his own.* Were they intended to ſhew, that Chriſt is God in as high a ſenſe as the Father? The direct contrary is maintained in ſeveral parts of this Diſcourſe, and particularly when Chriſt is ſtiled *a Son ſubject to the Father, as a Son receiving from him whatever he has of power, glory, and majeſty.* If Chriſt be *ſubject* to the Father, and has *received his all* from the Father, it neceſſarily follows, according to the principles of common ſenſe, that he is a perſon inferior to the Father; and conſequently, the doctrine contended for in the Appeal, is in effect confirmed by this very Diſcourſe.

His Lordſhip's argument to prove that Chriſt cannot be a creature, is ſubtle and confuſed. Doubtleſs Chriſt has Glories of his own, and ſo

have angels and other beings. But, according to his Lordſhip's own conceſſion, Chriſt has *received* them all from the Father as well as angels; and conſequently, the Glories of Chriſt can no more be ſaid to be his own independently of the Father, than the glories communicated to angels can in this ſenſe be their own: and yet the Glories of Chriſt and angels may in another ſenſe be juſtly called their own, as being peculiar to that nature which God hath given them. *Whoſoever*, ſays our Lord, Luke ix. 26. *ſhall be aſhamed of me and my words, of him ſhall the Son of Man be aſhamed, when he ſhall come in his own glory, and of the Father, and of the holy angels.* Here the Father is expreſsly ſaid to have glory peculiar to himſelf, the Son to have glory of his own, and the angels to have glory proper to their nature. As all creatures ſet forth the glory of God, ſo God hath communicated to Chriſt and angels a greater portion of glory than to any other beings; and conſequently, Chriſt and angels may be properly ſaid to have glories of their own upon the ſame account, they being ſuch as God hath appointed for them; and at the ſame time they cannot be ſaid to be their own by an inherent and independent right, as Chriſt and angels have received from the Father whatever power, glory and majeſty they are poſſeſſed of.

Again, does his Lordſhip mean that God hath communicated his very nature and eſſence to the Son? This, I apprehend, is an expreſs contradiction in terms, it being abſolutely impoſſible that God ſhould communicate his very nature to any other perſon or being, whether ſtiled his Son, or a creature, becauſe, upon this ſuppoſition, the Father and Son would be one and the ſame intelligent

ligent Being or Perſon. But this ſenſe ſeems diſclaimed by his Lordſhip in ſeveral parts of this Diſcourſe; more particularly, when he repreſents Chriſt as a perſon *made Lord* by Almighty God, as *given* and *exalted* by him. Indeed the main tenor of this Diſcourſe is abſolutely inconſiſtent with ſuch an abſurd doctrine.

I am at a loſs to fix his Lordſhip's preciſe meaning, when he reaſons in this manner: p. 35, 36. "The Form of God, in the firſt part, anſwers both to the form of a ſervant, and the likeneſs of men in the ſecond part: the form of a ſervant being common to all the different orders of creatures, it did not, of itſelf, ſufficiently expreſs what nature Chriſt took upon him, and therefore the addition in the likeneſs of man, was but neceſſary: but there are no different orders of beings, to whom the Form of God belongs: and therefore, the apoſtle having told us, that Chriſt was in the Form of God, there wanted no addition to inform us what kind or manner of being he was; for God has not communicated his Form or proper Glory to any of his creatures: the Form of God belongs to God only.

And thus the argument of our Saviour's divinity from this text ſtands. He had, before he came into the world, the true and proper glories of divinity; and under the Old Teſtament appeared in the real majeſty of his Father. Whether the proper and peculiar glories of the Divinity and the real majeſty of God are communicable to a creature, judge ye. Beſides, if the apoſtle by ſaying Chriſt took the Form of a ſervant, and the likeneſs of men, means, that he became indeed a very creature, and man; conſider what he means by the ſame expreſſion in the other part, where he

affirms, that Chriſt was in the Form of God; and whether he can mean leſs than that he was God, above all creatures, as the Son of the family is ſuperior to the ſervants, and *ſubject* to the Father, as a Son *receiving from him whatever he has of power, glory, and majeſty.*"

Anſ. Here I obſerve that his Lordſhip has not diſtinctly explained in what preciſe ſenſe we muſt take the divinity of Chriſt: we are told that he can be no *creature, nor leſs than God*, and that *the Form of God belongs to God only.* On the other hand, we are informed within the compaſs of a few lines, that Chriſt is *ſubject to the Father, as a Son receiving from him whatever he has of power, glory, and majeſty.* By the former account we are naturally led to conceive of Chriſt as God in as high a ſenſe as the Father; and by the latter we are taught to believe him to be inferior to the Father. The expreſſions on both ſides ſeem ſtrong and clear, and how to reconcile them, I know not. His Lordſhip very well knows, that the divinity of Chriſt as revealed in Scripture, is not denied by Unitarian Chriſtians, who contend for the notion of an inferior God, as being expreſsly warranted by our Lord himſelf. And does not his Lordſhip himſelf clearly acknowledge the ſame, when he ſtyles Chriſt a perſon ſubject to the Father.'

If his Lordſhip would inſinuate that Chriſt, according to the notion of the reputed orthodox, is equal to the Father, with reſpect to nature, eſſence, or ſubſtance; I muſt beg leave to declare that this is never ſet forth in Scripture, as plainly appears by all the ſenſes, in which Chriſt is deſcribed as the Son of God, not one of which has the leaſt relation to metaphyſical eſſence, or ſubſtance. See my defence.

His

His Lordſhip takes it for granted, that Chriſt *appeared under the Old Teſtament in the real majeſty of his Father.* Admitting the fact, Chriſt appeared as an Angel repreſenting the one Supreme God, and ſpake, and acted in his name; and therefore this is ſo far from proving the *ſupreme* divinity of Chriſt, that it directly overthrows any ſuch notion, the very ſame thing being applied to inferior Angels, who are frequently repreſented in the Old Teſtament as appearing, ſpeaking, and acting in the name of God. But with reſpect to this opinion of the Son's appearing under the Old Teſtament, tho' it has been generally entertained by antient and modern writers, it may be juſtly queſtioned whether it has any ſolid foundation in Scripture. The author of the Epiſtle to the Hebrews ſeems to take it for granted, that God never made any revelation by his Son till he appeared in the fleſh, Heb. i. 2. —Again Heb. 2. 2. The Apoſtle's argument is loſt, if the ſon was concerned in delivering the law to the Jewiſh people; for the force of it depends upon this, that the law was publiſhed by the miniſtry of Angels, and the Goſpel by that of Chriſt, and therefore, if diſobedience to the former was ſeverely condemned by Almighty God, how much more certain and ſevere will our puniſhment be, if we are regardleſs of the latter, as being delivered by a more exalted perſon than Angels, even the Lord Jeſus Chriſt? This is confirmed by other expreſs declarations, Acts vii. 38, 53. Galat. iii. 19.--Let Gen. 18 and 19 be compared with Heb. xiii. 2. as therefore the appearances under the Old Teſtament were made by Angels repreſenting God, the argument uſually urged to prove Chriſt's divinity from theſe appearances, is effectually demoliſhed.

With regard to his Lordſhip's next obſervation, *Whether the proper and peculiar glories of the divinity and the real Majeſty of God are communicable to a creature, judge ye*; I anſwer, either theſe expreſſions were intended to repreſent Chriſt as God equal to the Father, or they were not: if they were, this notion is expreſsly contradicted within the compaſs of a few lines, as obſerved before: if theſe expreſſions were not intended to ſet forth this notion, then it follows from his Lordſhip's premiſes, that God can communicate the proper glories of the divinity to an inferior being; and if every inferior being who is produced by, or derived from, God, may be juſtly deemed a creature, his Lordſhip is again involved in an expreſs contradiction. As to the term creature, it has been uſually made uſe of by Athanaſian writers to render the opinion of their adverſaries odious and contemptible? It is allowed by the Unitarians, that Chriſt is not expreſsly ſtyled a creature in Scripture; but certain it is that he is called the firſt being whom God produced or created. See my Defence.

All his Lordſhip's embarraſſment is occaſioned by aſſuming, that the *form of God* cannot mean leſs than that he was God, as the *form of a ſervant*, means that he became a very creature and man. That the *form of God* and the *form of a ſervant* anſwer to each other, is readily granted: but then the queſtion is, what is the true notion of form? If we conſider the conſtant uſe of the word form, it will appear that it never ſignifies nature or eſſence in the metaphyſical ſenſe, but only external ſhape, figure, or likeneſs. See my defence, where all the paſſages, wherein this word occurs, are taken notice of. The form of God therefore naturally ſignifies the likeneſs of God, which is confirmed by the

the parallel expreſſion, *the form of a ſervant* or ſlave, of which his Lordſhip hath not given the preciſe notion, when he conſiders this expreſſion as denoting the common mark and character of all the creatures of God: a ſlave which is the true notion of the word in this paſſage, ſignifies a perſon in a ſtate of abſolute ſubjection to a fellow-creature, and the form of a ſlave ſignifies the likeneſs of a ſlave, which exactly anſwers to the form of God: as Chriſt was in the form or likeneſs of God, ſo he was in the form or likeneſs of a ſlave. Remarkable it is, that our Saviour never was a ſlave in the ſtrict and literal ſenſe, but he put on the appearance of one, when he ſubmitted to ſuch treatment as ſlaves uſually meet with, and likewiſe when he died the death of a ſlave. See my Defence.

His Lordſhip has not given any particular explication of Chriſt being ſtyled *equal with God* according to our Engliſh tranſlation, which he juſtly contends runs parallel to *the form of God:* now the expreſſion in Greek ſignifies likeneſs of God, which ſtill farther demonſtrates that the *form of God* denotes likeneſs of God. See my Defence.

I agree with his Lordſhip, that the Apoſtle in the place before us ſays nothing of nature or eſſence. There are very ſparing intimations of metaphyſical nature or eſſence in Scripture. But I am ſurprized at his Lordſhip's inference, that *the natural powers and dignities of Chriſt were not increaſed, and that they were not capable of being increaſed.* Surely this cannot be truly ſaid of any perſon or being, excepting the one Supreme God. The natural powers of all inferior beings are capable of being encreaſed, or diminiſhed by Almighty God. Particularly we are aſſured, that Chriſt during ſome part of his ſtate of humiliation increaſed in wiſdom as well as

ſtature;

ſtature; and after his reſurrection we are informed, that all power was given him by the Father for the glorious purpoſe of the Goſpel diſpenſation, and conſequently, he then became poſſeſſed of a power which he had not before: again, whilſt Chriſt was upon earth, he did not know the day of judgment; but when he aſcended into heaven, it was revealed to him by the Father upon account of his extraordinary merits, as we are informed in the 5th ch. of Revelation, and conſequently his knowledge was then increaſed. How then can it be conſiſtently affirmed, that the natural powers of Chriſt were incapable of being increaſed? Are not power, knowledge, and wiſdom the natural powers of all intelligent beings? As for nature or eſſence conſidered as diſtinct from rational powers, it is a mere abſtract notion, of which we can form no clear idea.

The Contraſt which his Lordſhip has obſerved between Adam and Chriſt, I allow to be juſt and right; it indeed clearly illuſtrates and confirms the ſenſe of *likeneſs of God* here contended for. Adam was tempted to eat the forbidden fruit upon the hopes that it would make him like to God, and increaſe him in knowledge. On the other hand, Chriſt who was in the form or likeneſs of God, voluntarily laid aſide that likeneſs, and condeſcended to a mean and humble ſtate. Adam was puniſhed for his pride and preſumption; Chriſt was rewarded for his humility. This, I apprehend, is a plain and clear account, which is ſpoiled by his Lordſhip's obſervation, that *Chriſt had a right by nature to appear in the majeſty and glory of God.* It has been already ſhewn, that this is not the meaning of *the form of God:* It is likewiſe expreſsly contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture, which has, in the moſt

moſt ſolemn manner, determined Chriſt's dependence upon, and inferiority to, the one Supreme God: it is contradicted by ſeveral conceſſions in this very diſcourſe. Either this declaration was intended to ſet forth the Supreme Divinity of Chriſt, or it was not: if the former, how could Chriſt poſſibly diveſt himſelf of the glorious perfections of the divine nature, one of which is immutability? The three diſtinct ſtates of Chriſt, according to his Lordſhip's own account, undeniably demonſtrate that Chriſt cannot be God in as high a ſenſe as the Father, it being infinitely abſurd to imagine, that the Supreme God ſhould undergo any ſuch change. But if this declaration was not intended to ſet forth Chriſt's Supreme Divinity, then the argument formed from the Apoſtle's expreſſion *form of God*, to prove the Supreme Divinity, falls to the ground.

His Lordſhip when he is deſcribing Chriſt's pre-exiſtent ſtate, quotes John i. 2, 3. p. 15. 16. without giving the words any particular explication. But the worthy divine who has publiſhed this diſcourſe, has added a ſhort note, viz. *Whoever ſhall attempt to ſet aſide the plain import and authority of theſe and other texts of Scripture to the ſame purpoſe, by any low and trifling evaſions, cannot be ſaid to appeal to the common ſenſe of Chriſtians, or to write with any good ſenſe and judgment at all.*

Anſ. Thus has this learned divine endeavoured to overthrow the appeal to the common ſenſe of Chriſtians, by a ſmall daſh of his pen, without ſo much as attempting to write a direct anſwer to that little piece, and which I am now deeply convinced, is built upon a ſtrong foundation, there being few perſons in Europe more capable of overthrowing it than this extraordinary divine. The Athanaſian

doctrine in point of argument is gone, is gone for ever *.

But to come directly to the point: This worthy perſon very well knows, that the appellant never attempted to ſet aſide the authority of any texts of Scripture; but it has been his particular aim to contend for the authority of Scripture in oppoſition to the authority of man; to pay a greater regard to the decrees of the Moſt High God, than the determinations of the greateſt mortals upon earth; to prefer divine to human eſtabliſhments: upon this very account he has incurred the odium of his Brethren, and has expoſed himſelf to many difficulties in human life.

With reſpect to the Goſpel of St. John, one can ſcarce turn to any Chapter of it without obſerving, that Chriſt has in the moſt ſolemn manner, repreſented himſelf as a perſon inferior to his God and Father: there are above an hundred paſſages in this very Goſpel, that ſo ſtrongly, clearly, and deciſively ſet forth the ſupremacy of the Father, and inferiority of Chriſt, as cannot be evaded without deſtroying the uſe of language, and turning the Scripture itſelf into ridicule: our Lord ſeems to have choſen his expreſſions on purpoſe to guard againſt the infatuation of Chriſtian profeſſors, during the apoſtate ſtate of the church. When therefore St. John repreſents Chriſt in the beginning of his Goſpel as a God exiſting with God, can it be thought a low and trifling evaſion to interpret this conſiſtently with our Lord's own declarations, as recorded by St. John? Does not this learned divine very well know; that the word, God, was fre-

* Si Pergama Dextrâ
Defendi poſſent, etiam hac defenſa fuiſſent.

quently

quently uſed in an inferior ſenſe by Heathens, Jews, and the ſacred writers? And has not our Lord himſelf expreſsly contended for the notion of an inferior God? See Appeal and defence. The Biſhop himſelf in this very diſcourſe has deſcribed the Son as ſubject to, and receiving all his power and authority from the Father; and therefore, if his lordſhip be conſiſtent with himſelf, he cannot be ſuppoſed to interpret this famous paſſage of St. John in the ſenſe of making Chriſt God in as high a ſenſe as the Father: and this worthy and extraordinary perſon has delivered it as his opinion under his own hand, that he *never denied any ſuperiority in the God and Father of all that is conſiſtent with the divinity and worſhip of the Son.* How therefore can this Chriſtian divine charge the appellant with low and trifling evaſions, when he interprets the title of God conſiſtently with the acknowledgement of the one Supreme God and Father of all, by the expreſs authority of our Saviour; when this truth is maintained in the very diſcourſe he has publiſhed himſelf; and he himſelf has been obliged, in a private debate, by the brightneſs of evidence to confeſs the ſame?

But this ingenious divine ſeems to lay the greateſt ſtreſs upon the work of creation being aſcribed to Chriſt, and denies his inſtrumental agency under God the Father: he looks upon this ſenſe as ſupported only by low and trifling evaſions, and ſeems very confident, that it has no foundation in language. Let this affair be examined to the bottom.

That the prepoſition (διὰ) with a genitive caſe is frequently uſed to expreſs inſtrumental or inferior agency undeniably appears from many expreſs inſtances in the New Teſtament. John i, 17. The law

law was given *by Moſes*, (Δια Μωσεως)—Acts ii. 43. and many ſigns and wonders were done *by the Apoſtles*. (Δια των Αποστολων)—Acts v. 12. and *by the hands of the Apoſtles* * were many ſigns and wonders wrought.—Acts xix. 11. and God wrought ſpecial miracles *by the hands of Paul*. (Δια των χειρων Παυλε) ---Galat. iii. 19. *ordained by Angels*. (δι' αγγελων) It is unneceſſary to produce more inſtances to confirm this obſervation, that (Δια) with a genitive caſe is frequently uſed to expreſs inferior agency. When therefore it is affirmed that grace and truth came *by Chriſt*, (Δια Χριστε) as well as that the law was given *by Moſes*, (Δια Μωσεως) it is ſurely very natural to infer that as Moſes was inſtrumentally employed by God in the delivery of the law, ſo Chriſt was inſtrumentally employed in eſtabliſhing the Goſpel Covenant. Again, when it is declared, Acts 2. 22. that Jeſus of Nazareth was a man approved by God amongſt you by ſigns and wonders which God did *by him*; (Δι' αυτε) is not this exactly parallel to what is ſaid of the Apoſtles v. 43. that many ſigns were done *by the Apoſtles*; (Δια Αποστολων) and likewiſe to Acts xix. 11. God wrought ſpecial miracles by the hands of Paul? (Δια των χειρων Παυλε) and conſequently, the agency of Chriſt in working miracles is of an inferior nature, tho' doubtleſs ſuperior to that of the Apoſtles. When, therefore, all things are ſaid to be made by (or thro') him (Δια αυτε,) this muſt be interpreted of inſtrumental agency, which ſenſe is ſtrongly confirmed by the uſe of a different prepoſition, when the agency of God the Father is ſet forth. 1 Cor. viii. 6. To us (viz. Chriſtians) there is but one God, the Father, *of whom* (εξ ε) are all things, and we

* Δια χειρων των Αποστολων.

for

for him; and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt *by (or thro') whom* (δι ου) are all things, and we *by (or thro') him* (δι' αυτου) Ephes. iii. 9. God who created all things *by (or thro') Jeſus Chriſt* (δια Ιησου Χριστου) add to this, that the inſtrumental agency of Chriſt was intended by the ſacred writers, appears by the uniform conſent of the primitive church; and more particularly, Origen and Euſebius, two very learned Greek writers, have taken notice of the diſtinction here contended for.

What is urged on the other ſide to invalidate theſe obſervations is, that (δι' ου) *by whom*, is ſometimes applied to the Father, viz. Rom. xi. 36. Heb. 2. 10. and *in him* ('εν αυτω) is applied to the Son, Coloſs. 1. 16. with reſpect to this objection, it is carefully to be obſerved, that *thro' him* or *whom* (δι' ου) when applied to the Father, never ſignifies the orginal production of things by his Almighty Power, but the preſervation, or government of things thro' his providential care, or ſomething to this effect. Thus when the Apoſtle declares of God, *of him and through him and to him are all things*; (εξ αυτου, και δι' αυτου, και εις αυτον τα παντα) Rom. xi. 36. The meaning is, from him as the original and efficient cauſe are all things; through his providential care they are preſerved; and to his glory they all redound. Thus Heb. 2. 10. It became him *for whom are all things* (δι ον τα παντα) * that is, upon whoſe account, or to whoſe ultimate glory all things were created; and thro' whom are all things: (δι' ου τα παντα) The meaning certainly

* Δια with an accuſative caſe ſignifies upon the account of; thus Matth. 10. 22. (δια το ονομα μου) for my name's ſake; Matth. 19. 12. (δια την βασιλειαν των ουρανων) for the kingdom of Heaven's ſake; Mark, 2. 4. (δια τον οχλον) upon the account of the multitude.

is

is thro' whoſe providence all things are governed. From whence it plainly appears, that the word (δια) *through*, never ſignifies the original efficiency of the firſt cauſe; and it neceſſarily conveys a different ſenſe, when it is uſed in expreſs contradiſtinction to original efficiency; 1 Cor. viii. 6. Rom. xi. 36. Epheſ. 3. 9.

With reſpect to (εν αυτω) *by him*, Coloſſ. i. 16. it is of the ſame import with (δι' αυτε) *by him*, in the ſame verſe, as obſerved in my Defence.

As to that objection, that creation is aſcribed to Chriſt without any of the diſtinctive prepoſitions; the only text produced in proof of this is, Heb. Ch. i. 10. But very conſiderable evidence has been offered to ſhew, that the Apoſtle directed this to God the Father. See my Appeal and Defence.

There has lately appeared another objection formed upon Luke ii. 26. and it was revealed unto him *by* (υπο) the Holy Ghoſt, that he ſhould not ſee death, before he had ſeen the Lord's Chriſt. From hence it is inferred, that the prime agency of the Holy Ghoſt in this affair is denoted according to the Unitarian diſtinction; otherwiſe, the prepoſition thro' (δια) would have been uſed. But that no ſuch inference can be rightly drawn from this inſtance, is evident, becauſe the prepoſition *by* (υπο) is never uſed in the ſame diſtinctive manner with *thro'* (δια) but is indifferently applied to any thing or tranſaction, whether performed by God or inferior Beings. Thus the Angel Gabriel was ſent *from* (υπο) God. Luke 1. 26.—This is he that was ſpoken of *by* (υπο) the Prophet Eſaias. Matt. iii. 3.——Then Herod when he ſaw that he was mocked *by* (υπο) the wiſe men, Matt. ii. 16.—To be tempted *of* or *by* (υπο) the Devil. Matt. iv. 1. ——A reed ſhaken *by* (υπο) the wind. Matt. xi. 7.

But

But how does this indifferent uſe of the prepoſition (υπο) prove, that the prepoſition (δια) was not deſigned to expreſs inferior agency, when it is uſed in contradiſtinction to the ſupreme efficiency of Almighty God, which is expreſſed by another prepoſition?

But what may have conſiderable weight in determining this point, namely, the inſtrumental agency of Chriſt in the work of creation, the Biſhop himſelf expreſſes the ſame notion in this very diſcourſe: *Chriſt Jeſus was indeed ſubſervient to his Father in the creation of the worlds.* p. 54. His Lordſhip indeed in another part of this diſcourſe obſerves, that St. *John, when he ſpeaks of Chriſt's eternal and inherent power, aſcribes the creation of all things to him.* If his Lordſhip means by this Expreſſion, that Chriſt was eternal in the ſame unlimited ſenſe with the Father, and that he was poſſeſſed of an abſolute inherent power independent of the Father; this is expreſsly contradicted by the Scripture account, which ſtyles him *the firſt-born of every creature*, and *the beginning of the creation of God*, or the firſt being whom God produced, or created; and conſequently neither eternity, nor power can be aſcribed to him in the ſame abſolute ſenſe with the Father: let Chriſt be ſuppoſed ever ſo excellent and glorious, yet ſtill he *received* all his perfections from the one ſupreme God, to whom our Lord himſelf made the moſt ſolemn acknowledgments.

With reſpect to Chriſt's Eternity, his Lordſhip ſeems to take it for granted, that he himſelf has aſſerted it, John viii. *Before Abraham was, I am.* He thinks this declaration neceſſarily ſignifies his eternity and permanency of duration; juſt as God in the Old Teſtament choſe to expreſs his own eternity and power, when Moſes enquired after the name

of God, in theſe words, *I am that I am, thus ſhalt thou ſay to the children of Iſrael, I am hath ſent me unto you.* Exod. iii. 14. p. 16, 17.

Anſ. 1. I obſerve that the words of our Saviour may be juſtly rendered, *before Abraham was, I was,* which overthrows his Lordſhip's argument to prove his eternity; for in this caſe the aſſertion proves no more than that Chriſt had an exiſtence before Abraham. There are ſeveral inſtances produced in my Defence, whereby it appears that the paſt time is frequently expreſſed in Scripture by a word uſually denoting the preſent time (*viz.* εἰμὶ). 2. 'Tis far from being certain, that *I am that I am* in the Old Teſtament was intended to ſet forth the eternity and neceſſary exiſtence of God. The learned Biſhop Hare, as obſerved in my Defence, has given another interpretation more natural and rational, as being well adapted to the temper of the Iſraelites, to whom the words were directed, and of which ſenſe they are ſtrictly capable. He has very ingeniouſly proved that the name Jehovah, * which is founded upon theſe words *I am that I am,* is no more than a relative term originally intended to ſhew the Iſraelites, that Moſes received his commiſſion from the God of their fathers, Abraham, Iſaac, and Jacob: this ſenſe ſeems vaſtly more probable, and would ſtrike the minds of the Iſraelites with greater force, than a metaphyſical account of God's eternity and neceſſary exiſtence.

His Lordſhip ſeems to treat the notion of a new creation entertained by many Unitarian Chriſtians, as highly abſurd. But when all the paſſages relative to this point, are nicely compared, a new creation does not appear ſo forced and unnatural, as it has

* Vid. Prolegomena in Pſalmos, p. 13, 14, 15.

been

been commonly repreſented. Remarkable it is, that in all thoſe paſſages wherein Chriſt is ſet forth as ſubſervient to God in the work of creation, the heaven and the earth are never expreſsly mentioned. Heb. i. 10. to which his Lordſhip refers, is not applied to the Son, but God the Father. See Appen. and Defenſe. However, whether the old, or the new creation, was intended by the ſacred writers, which is one of thoſe points for which probable arguments may be urged on both ſides, certain it is that Chriſt is repreſented as an inferior inſtrument acting in ſubordination to God the ſupreme Creator. Again, however this point be determined, his Lordſhip fairly acknowledges, that no worſhip is due to Chriſt upon account of the part he bore in the work of creation, but is entirely founded upon a command of the Father, in conſequence of the redemption. I take a particular ſatisfaction in giving my hearty aſſent to his Lordſhip's account of the honour and worſhip paid to Chriſt in Scripture, and beg leave to make ſome obſervations upon this Scripture doctrine.

1. If Chriſt *was made Lord* of all things *by the Father*, when he had perfected the redemption of the world; if the power now exerciſed by the Son is the *Father's power*, which, as it is at laſt to be *given up to him*, ſo was it at firſt *received* from him: if *the Father* hath *exalted Chriſt* to the right-hand of his Majeſty on high, and *given him* to be head over all principalities and powers: if this be a clear account of the affair, as delivered in his Lordſhip's own words; from theſe premiſes it undeniably follows, that the Father is the one ſupreme God, and that Chriſt, even in his moſt exalted ſtate, is a perſon inferior to the one ſupreme God, by whom he was advanced to his dignity and honour, and

from whom he has received all the power and authority, with which he is inveſted for the government of the church. 'Tis high time for Chriſtians to lay aſide all unneceſſary altercations about nature and eſſence, and to fix upon this foundation, wherein all muſt be uniformly agreed; ſo that, whether Chriſt was employed by God in the work of creation, or not; whether he was produced by the Father before all ages; or whether thoſe few paſſages, wherein his ſuppoſed pre-exiſtent ſtate is deſcribed, may not poſſibly be capable of another ſenſe; Chriſtians ſhould embrace each other as brethren in Chriſt, who are ready to profeſs, according to his Lordſhip's own account, that *Jeſus is the Lord*, that *God raiſed him from the dead*, and that *God hath made him head of the Church*, and *given him all power and authority* for the government of it. This is the grand point in which Chriſtians are mainly concerned: and happy had it been for the Chriſtian world, if their zeal and attention had been chiefly employed upon the plain and eſſential points of Chriſt's religion.

2. If, according to his Lordſhip's account, the foundation of the worſhip paid to Chriſt, be derived from his exaltation: if the worſhip paid to God the Father, is founded upon his being Creator of all things: if the worſhip paid to Chriſt, is founded in this, that he was ſlain, and did by his blood redeem us: if all the honour paid to Chriſt be ultimately referred to the glory of God the Father: if the worſhip of Chriſt be conſiſtent with the divine law, *thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve*, becauſe 'tis part of the ſervice we owe to God, as being practiſed in conſequence of the power and glory conferred on him by God, and in virtue of a command received from

God;

God: if we cannot form our devotions from a better copy than the hymns recorded in the Revelation of St. John: if this be a faithful repreſentation of Scripture worſhip, as it certainly is, it neceſſarily follows, that the diſtinction about ſupreme and inferior worſhip, is ſolid and ſcriptural; and that the doctrine delivered in the Appeal and this Defence, relating to this important point, is ſupported by the authority of this eminent Biſhop: from his Lordſhip's premiſſes it neceſſarily follows, that the direct invocation of the Holy Spirit in prayer, praiſe, or glory, and the worſhip of three perſons and one God, are not warranted by Scripture; God and Chriſt being the only objects, to whom the hymns in Revelation are directed; and we cannot, as his Lordſhip rightly obſerves, form our devotions from a better copy than that which they have ſet us. Remarkable it is, that his Lordſhip has given the ſame interpretation of the 4th and 5th chap. of the Revelation that is found in the Appeal.

As therefore the Athanaſian doctrine and worſhip ſeem to be given up in the pulpit, ſurely the conduct of the Appellant ſhould not be ſo much blamed, who has thought himſelf obliged to practiſe in the public worſhip of Almighty God, according to the pattern of Scripture; in other terms, 'tis certainly *right* to practiſe in the pew conſiſtently with the doctrine delivered in the pulpit. 'Tis not conſiſtent with the character of Chriſtian divines to contend for the Uſe of Forms, merely becauſe eſtabliſhed by public authority. Has the civil power a right to appoint beings to be invoked, without any warrant from the God of Gods? If the civil power has any ſuch right, 'tis abſolute nonſenſe to talk of a Revelation from heaven; for if God has

has determined one thing, and the civil power the direct contrary, we muſt, in this caſe, prefer the authority of mortal men to that of the moſt high Lord of heaven and earth. This impious principle (for ſo I muſt beg leave to ſtyle it) has a natural tendency to ſanctify all the vile ſuperſtition and abſurd idolatry that ever obtained in the heathen and Chriſtian world. Gods eſtabliſhed by law have eclipſed in many places, and in others have quite extinguiſhed among men the glory of the one ſupreme God; and one great deſign of our Lord's coming into the world was, to demoliſh this heathen principle, namely, that 'tis the duty of all people to worſhip the gods eſtabliſhed in their reſpective countries.

Upon the whole, let his Lordſhip's account of Scripture worſhip be uniformly purſued: let Chriſtians of all denominations be exhorted *to bow their knees to the* Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt — *who hath bleſſed us with all ſpiritual bleſſings in heavenly things, in or through Chriſt*; let them learn to be content with joining with *many angels round about the throne, and the living creatures and the elders, ſaying, Worthy is the Lamb that was ſlain to receive power, riches, and wiſdom, and ſtrength, and honour, and glory and bleſſing*; *and with the whole creation, ſaying, Bleſſing, and honour, and glory, and power be unto him that ſitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.* Let the eminent Biſhop of London ſet his Clergy and people a noble and Chriſtian example, by omitting, when he officiates in public, thoſe parts of our public forms that break in upon the worſhip eſtabliſhed by the expreſs authority of God, and which Scripture worſhip his Lordſhip himſelf has recommended from the pulpit. Let Miniſters of all denominations be perſuaded

ſuaded to adhere cloſely to the directions of our bleſſed Lord in the grand point of religious worſhip, and to follow the pattern ſo plainly laid before them by the holy Apoſtles, without any regard to the authority of man. Let Chriſtian people be honeſtly inſtructed, that no power upon earth has a right to impoſe articles of Faith, and forms * of worſhip, upon the conſciences of Chriſtians, without an expreſs warrant from that one *Lawgiver who is able to ſave and to deſtroy.*

In order to induce Chriſtian Miniſters and people to comply with their duty in this important point, I ſhall make an obſervation that naturally ariſes from the Biſhop's text, and which will be found at laſt of infinitely more conſequence than the moſt exact notions of Chriſt's perſon and dignity; and that is, the indiſpenſible obligation we are under, as Chriſtians, to imitate the example of Chriſt ſo powerfully recommended to us by St. Paul in this remarkable paſſage: *Let this mind*, ſays he, *be in you which was alſo in Chriſt Jeſus; who being in the form of God, &c.* If ſo glorious and divine a perſon condeſcended ſo low, and willingly ſuffered ſo much in the cauſe of God and truth; we that profeſs ourſelves his diſciples, whether Miniſters or people, are ſtrongly called upon to diſregard all worldly concerns, when the honour of the one ſupreme God is the point in queſtion. 'Tis certainly our duty to give up all public authority, and to run all poſſible hazards, in order to reſtore that pure and holy religion which Chriſt eſtabliſhed, and which has been ſo much corrupted and depraved in all Chriſtian countries; that we may contribute our part towards the haſtening of that bleſſed

* I mean with reſpect to the object.

time,

time, when we are aſſured by Scripture prophecy, that all the kingdoms of the world ſhall become the kingdoms of God and of his Chriſt. Above all, let the glorious rewards promiſed to God's faithful ſervants, more particularly aſcertained by Chriſt's example, excite our obedience. If the things of this preſent world too ſtrongly engage our affections, let us conſider the bleſſed Jeſus ſeemingly abandoned by God and man, ſuffering a painful and ſcandalous death upon the croſs; and afterwards let us view him exalted to the higheſt pitch of dignity and honour, as a reward of his obedience and humility. Our Lord himſelf after his exalted ſtate, has made the application, in which all his real diſciples, whether Miniſters or people, ſhould think themſelves nearly concerned. *To him that overcometh*, ſays Chriſt, *will I grant to ſit with me in my throne, even as I alſo overcame, and am ſet down with my Father in his throne.* Revel. iii. 21. *Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life.* Revel. ii. 10. Let us extend our views to that ſolemn time, when our Lord ſhall appear in his glorious majeſty to judge the quick and dead; and let us faithfully repreſent to our ſouls what queſtions may poſſibly or probably be aſked at that tremendous time; and we ſhall want no encouragement to purſue the cauſe of Chriſt's religion, with ſincerity, fortitude, and perſeverance, in oppoſition to every intereſt of this ſhort and dying life.

I think it but common juſtice to obſerve that there is another interpretation given of this controverted paſſage in the Philippians by ſome worthy Chriſtians, and which is far from being unreaſonable. The Biſhop indeed takes it for granted, that the words neceſſarily refer to Chriſt's pre-exiſtent ſtate; and probably they do ſo: but they are certainly

tainly capable of a good ſenſe, without any reference to a pre-exiſtent ſtate. The 6th, 7th, and 8th verſes may be thus paraphraſed: "Who, tho' he was like the moſt high God, and repreſented his majeſty and power to us by virtue of extraordinary miracles, and likewiſe by that honour which was given him by men upon account of his amazing power, yet was not eager to retain that likeneſs of God; but, in condeſcenſion to the will of God, he laid aſide that glorious ſtate, and became like a ſlave, by ſuffering himſelf to be treated as ſuch, with all ſorts of indignities, and ſo appeared as a common man; and being thus found in his external ſtate and condition like a common mortal, he humbled himſelf ſo far at the will of God as to ſubmit, not only to death, but the moſt painful and ſcandalous death of the croſs." *Wherefore God alſo hath highly exalted him, &c.*

According to this explication, we have three diſtinct ſtates of Jeſus Chriſt clearly pointed out: 1. A ſtate of dignity whilſt he was engaged in miraculous operations. 2. His ſtate of humility, whilſt he was in the power of his enemies, from whom he ſuffered ſo much. 3. His exaltation to a more glorious ſtate than he enjoyed before, as a reward of his humility and obedience. The ſenſe given of theſe expreſſions *was made in the likeneſs of men*, or became like men, *and was made in the likeneſs of men*, may be juſtified by Judg. chap. xvi. ver. 7, 11, 17. where Samſon, though he was a man, yet ſays he ſhould become as any other man, if ſuch and ſuch things were done unto him.

FINIS.

24 OC 62